The Solicitors Journal.

LONDON, FEBRUARY 6, 1886.

CURRENT TOPICS.

We believe that nothing was settled up to Thursday evening about the Solicitor-Generalship, but there seems to be little doubt that the selection rests between Mr. Davey, Q.C., and Mr. Rigby, Q.C.

Sir Farrer Herschell returned his briefs on Wednesday. His elevation to the woolsack will be cordially greeted by the profession. He will not only add great weight to the ultimate Court of Appeal, but his strong bent towards well-considered legal reforms, coupled with his sound judgment and intimate acquaintance with the practical working of the present system of procedure, are likely to produce results of no small value to the profession and the public. He attains the Chancellorship at about the same age as Lord Cairns, and in many respects is qualified to win the position which has been vacant since his death. Ten years ago the new Lord Chancellor propounded a very practical scheme for the gradual codification of our law, which, it may be presumed, he will not lose sight of should circumstances give him the opportunity of carrying it out.

It is perhaps somewhat singular that but little attention has been paid by English land law reformers to the Irish system of registry of deeds and record of title. This is the more remarkable because you find the two systems of registration of assurances and registration of indefeasible titles working side by side in the same country. Mr. Osborne Morgan's Land Title and Transfer Committee in 1879 took some very valuable evidence on the working of the Acts, evidence which is remarkable as shewing great diversity of opinion as to the benefit of the two systems by persons familiar with the working of each of them. Further information as to the working of these Acts is desirable, the more so as three different systems of searching the register of deeds are in force—(1) an official negative search, a search made and certified to be correct by an officer of the office; (2) a common search made, but not certified, by an officer, and (3) a search made by the solicitor to the parties, as in the case of the Middlesex Registry. We print elsewhere a valuable letter by Mr. Dix, a well-known Dublin solicitor, on the working of the Irish Registry Acts, which we commend to the consideration of our readers.

It is understood that, in revising the Supreme Court Funds Rules, the Treasury, being desirous that greater facilities should be afforded for transmitting money by post from the Paymaster, propose that, in addition to the names of creditors and others who are entitled to payments under £500, the addresses should, in all cases, be inserted in the schedules on which the Paymaster is to act. We cannot believe that solicitors will willingly submit to the delay and expense which such a requirement would entail, at any rate in the case of creditors. It frequently happens that in creditors' suits the chief clerk's certificate only gives names without addresses, or very limited addresses, such as "William Brown, York"; it also often occurs that, before debts are paid, the members constituting a firm are changed, as well as the place of business, or a creditor becomes bankrupt, or the debt is otherwise assigned. All these circumstances are matters for proof, and it would be very inconvenient if the completion of a chief clerk's certificate of debts must wait until the address of every creditor named therein were supplied. A very cursory inspection of No. 48 of the present Supreme Court Funds Rules will show the precautions necessary to secure that money sent by post shall reach the rightful owner. The effect of requiring these or similar precautions to be enforced before the completion of a chief clerk's certificate of debts might be to entail great delay and expense. In the case of periodical payments the present rule appears to be amply sufficient.

The small amount of discussion which was elicited by Mr. Melvill Green's excellent paper on the Death Duties at the Liverpool meeting fully justified the author in re-opening the subject at the meeting of the Incorporated Law Society on Friday, and the debate elicited opinions which shewed that the council are fully alive to the importance of the questions discussed. It seems not improbable that action may have to be taken upon the subject at an early date, and it may be suggested whether it is desirable to wait until the Budget is produced. Surely a careful and concise statement submitted for the consideration of the members of the Government and the departmental authorities would be of more service by way of influencing the proposals made than criticism upon them would be after they have been made. Mr. Green's suggestion that solicitors should be more careful in advising their clients, in making their wills, as to what will be the incidence of the death duties is valuable and well timed. He gave an instance at Liverpool in which £540 was saved to one estate by careful consideration on this point. As to the other matters discussed at the recent meeting, there is little to be said. There is no doubt that matters as regards the legal education of articled clerks are not in a satisfactory state. The fact is that the "crammers" are everywhere driving the lecturers and law classes out of the field. The complaint arises not merely in London, but also at Birmingham, that the lectures and classes are not so well attended as they ought to be. But how this is to be obviated is not apparent, and no doubt the council will welcome discussion which tends towards any practical remedy.

A correspondent draws attention in another column to an effect of the rule debarring a solicitor-trustee from profit costs which has apparently been overlooked by the courts. The result of the rule is to defeat the intention of the testator. We think it must be admitted that a testator who selects a solicitor to be his executor or trustee always intends that the legal work connected with the administration of his estate shall be done by the professional executor or trustee, and that he shall be paid out of the estate. But, unless the testator expresses this intention, the rule of equity steps in and defeats it, and practically deprives the estate of the services of the solicitor known to and trusted by the testator. It is curious to observe how completely this consideration has been lost sight of. In the case which first distinctly laid down the rule—*New* v. *Jones*, given in Jarman's Conveyancing (3rd ed., p. 731)—Lord Lyndhurst, C.B., said that, "If an attorney, who is an executor, performs business that is necessary to be transacted, he is not entitled to be repaid for those duties; it would be placing his interest at variance with the duties he had to discharge. It was said that the bill might be taxed, and that this would be a sufficient check. He was of opinion that it would not be a sufficient check. The estate had a right not only to the protection of the taxing officer, but also to the vigilance and guardianship of the executor or trustee, in addition to the check of the taxing officer. There might be cases where a trustee, placed in the situation of a solicitor, might, if he were allowed to perform the duties of a solicitor, and to be paid for them, find it often very proper to institute and carry on legal proceedings, which he would not do if he were to derive no emolument from them himself, and if he were to employ another person." It is

obvious that it never occurred to Lord LYNDHURST that a testator would not be likely to make a solicitor his executor or trustee unless he had the fullest confidence in his integrity; that the object of a testator in appointing a solicitor as his executor is to obtain the benefit of his professional skill and knowledge in the actual transaction of the business of his estate; that no testator could expect this to be given gratuitously, and that no busy solicitor would be likely either to do professional work for nothing or to accept the gratuitous and ungrateful office of superintending another solicitor in the transaction of such work. He may do this if he chooses (*Macnamara* v. *Jones*, 2 Dick. 587; see *Stanes* v. *Parker*, 9 Beav., at p. 389), but subject to this liability, that the client of the solicitor so employed will be the trustee, and the claim for costs will be against the trustee personally, and not against the trust estate (*Worrall* v. *Harford*, 8 Ves. 1), and that before the trustee is recouped the *cestui que trust* is entitled to have the reasonableness of the charges in the solicitor's bill ascertained. The result of Lord LYNDHURST's decision has been the addition to all wills appointing solicitor-executors or trustees of a common form clause; but, as our correspondent points out, its insertion is unpleasant to the solicitor; and it is certainly worthy of consideration whether the time has not come when the necessity for its insertion should be obviated by legislation. Why should not Mr. WOLSTENHOLME's clause dealing with this and other matters be embodied in a short Bill?

LORD COLERIDGE has most properly assured the public, through the *Times*, that any proved case of "touting" for fees by ushers of the Queen's Bench Division will be "promptly and effectually dealt with." For an usher to solicit or receive money from a suitor is a gross outrage on propriety, and we think, also, that there is little doubt that it is an offence cognizable by law. There are, at least, four enactments prohibiting the receipt of gratuities by officers of a court, and all of them have been carefully saved from the deluge of repeal which has swept over the court of law statutes of the pre-Judicature Act period. There is the Masters Act of 1837 (1 Vict. c. 30), s. 19, there is the Crown Office Act of 1843 (6 Vict. c. 20), s. 11, and there are the Chancery and Common Law Courts Acts of 1852 (15 & 16 Vict. c. 87, s. 3, and 15 & 16 Vict. c. 73, s. 26), all of which Acts, by virtue of section 76 of the Judicature Act of 1873, apply *mutatis mutandis* to the Supreme Court, or, as the Act puts it, "take effect as if the High Court of Justice or the Court of Appeal had been named therein instead of the courts named therein respectively." The words of section 3 of the Chancery Courts Act of 1852 are, that "if any officer of the Court of Chancery or any of the judges thereof shall, for anything done or pretended to be done relating to his office, situation, or employment, wilfully take, demand, receive, or accept any fee, gift, gratuity, or emolument, or anything of value other than his salary," the person so offending, when duly convicted, shall forfeit and pay the sum of five hundred pounds, "and shall be removed from his office, and be ever thereafter incapable of holding any office in the court or otherwise serving her Majesty." The words of the 26th section of the Common Law Courts Act are similar, except that the penalty is fifty pounds only, and that in addition to "officers" the section speaks of "any clerk appointed by virtue of the Act, or any person whatever employed in the offices of the said courts." The whole series of enactments is saved from the sweeping repeals effected by the Judicature Officers Act, 1879 (42 & 43 Vict. c. 78). We think there is little doubt that an usher is an officer of the court, his duty being to preserve order during a trial or hearing. Whether the asking for a sum of money from a suitor would be a breach of the enactments would, of course, depend on the circumstances of each case; the Acts merely prohibit the solicitation "for anything done or pretended to be done" in relation to the office. It will be observed that the Acts are not confined to the protection of suitors, and it would seem that ushers, if any such there be, who should so far forget themselves as to take money for admitting any of the public into court during a "sensation trial" would gravely imperil their official position. At the same time there are fees to ushers which rest on a different footing. There are cases in which the ushers of the court are able to do considerable volunteer service by moving heavy boxes of books or papers required to be brought into court, and by taking charge of such things from day to day while a case is pending. It would be inconvenient if they refused to perform these useful offices, as would probably be the case if they were forbidden under any circumstances to receive any honorarium on pain of instant dismissal.

THE STRESS of the "Act of Anne," 6 Anne, c. 7, whereby many members of the new Government will be compelled to seek re-election, will be greatly felt in the coming week. The 25th section of the Act provides that "if any person, being chosen a member of the House of Commons, shall accept of any office of profit from the Crown," his election shall be void, and a new writ shall issue for a new election, "as if such person so accepting was naturally dead," provided that such person shall be capable of being again elected. Two difficult questions of construction arise upon this section. The first is, whether the words "office of profit from the Crown" include such offices as those of Under-Secretaries of State, or are confined to the major offices held directly from the Crown. On this point the practice, which is in favour of the Under-Secretaries (see May's Practice, 9th ed., p. 704), has been too long settled to be now disturbed, but, treating the question as one of pure construction, we cannot think the legal position of the Under-Secretaries so secure as it has been generally considered. The second question is, whether the acceptance of an office of profit is taken out of the section by a renunciation of the profit. Here the practice is conflicting, Mr. BATHURST in 1821, and Mr. GLADSTONE in 1874, not having vacated their seats by such an acceptance of office, while Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE, on an appointment as Lord of the Treasury, without salary, in 1881, resigned his seat, and was re-elected.

IF A DEFENDANT appears in a county court he cannot afterwards dispute the jurisdiction of the county court by applying for a prohibition. So it was laid down more than thirty years ago by ERLE, C.J., in *Jones* v. *James* (19 L. J. Q. B. 257), and this decision was followed with approval by HANNEN and MATHEW, JJ., in *Mouflet* v. *Washbourne* on Thursday last. This case had been remitted to the county court from the High Court with the defendant's consent, but the defendant, who had counter-claimed for unliquidated damages, afterwards sought to take advantage of *Knight* v. *Abbott* (31 W. R. 505, L. R. 10 Q. B. D. 11), in which it had been held that the High Court had no power to order an action for unliquidated damages to be tried in a county court, and *Mackay* v. *Bannister* (34 W. R. 121, L. R. 6 Q. B. D. 174), in which it was held that where there was a counter-claim for unliquidated damages the jurisdiction of the court to remit was gone. We fail to discover any flaw in the reasoning of the judgment in the last case, but we think it a defect in the legislation on the subject (see 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, s. 26; Judicature Act, 1873, s. 90; Judicature Act, 1884, s. 18), that the jurisdiction to remit should be barred by a counter-claim for unliquidated damages of trifling amount.

THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS of sale, which were used on the sale of 39,153 acres of land in the Transvaal, at the Auction Mart last week will be interesting, having regard to the discussions on land registry. They may possibly be prophetic of future transactions in England:—

"IV.—The property being situate in the Transvaal, where there is a compulsory registration of deeds of transfer, the title shall commence in respect of each lot with the last deed of transfer, registered at the Land Registry of Farms at Pretoria. These deeds of transfer may be inspected by any intending purchaser, at any time before the sale at the said offices of the vendor's solicitors during office hours, and, as these form the only evidence of the vendor's title which can be produced in this country, the vendor will not furnish any abstract of his title.

"V.—The expense of obtaining, furnishing, making, or verifying any extract from the Land Registry at Pretoria or elsewhere in the Transvaal, or in England, shall be borne by the purchaser. Also all searches, inquiries, journeys to and from the Transvaal, all cable messages, all notarial and other expenses of a similar nature for any of the above lots shall be borne by the purchaser requiring the same, the purchaser also paying all fees, transfer dues, stamps, registration, and other expenses required by the Transvaal Government or otherwise."

Application was made on Tuesday last to Mr. Justice Pearson, by motion without notice, to add to an order for absolute foreclosure a direction to discharge a receiver who had been appointed in the action (*Jenner-Fust* v. *Needham*). It appeared that the amount due on the mortgage was £10,000, but that the receiver had upwards of £1,000 in hand. Mr. Justice Pearson declined, at the moment, to make the order asked for, on the ground that the mere fact of the receiver taking rents opened the accounts, but he said he would consider the matter and do what he could. An order absolute for foreclosure is one of those orders designated as "of course," and is obtained *ex parte*, but it is difficult to see how an order to discharge a receiver who has not passed his accounts can be made without notice or consent. To whom is he to hand the balance in his hands? is not the mortgagor entitled to it if the land goes to the mortgagee?

THE COUNCIL OF THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY ON THE REFORM OF THE LAND LAWS.

II.

We now propose to explain in detail some of the more important schemes that have been proposed for the simplification of the title to, and the transfer of, land, and subsequently we shall discuss their relative advantages and disadvantages.

(1) Mr. Wolstenholme's Scheme.

Having regard to the high praise given in the Statement to the scheme of Mr. Wolstenholme, we will commence with it.

Mr. Wolstenholme says, in an article in the *Papers of the Juridical Society*, p. 533:—"For all the purposes of sale trustees or mortgagees are in the position of absolute owners. The rights of the beneficiaries are to the proceeds of the sale only. There is no reason why this principle should not be extended, and why every person in whom an estate, legal or equitable, is vested as trustee or mortgagee, or in any other character, should not be deemed to have an absolute power of disposition, not merely for the purposes of sale, but for all purposes, and as against all persons with respect to whom his estate is paramount."

He proposes (1) to adhere to the existing practice of shewing title by written documents only; (2) that the *legal* fee should not be cut up into lesser estates of freehold or into estates for years determinable on lives; (3) that, as regards any *bonâ fide* purchaser, every person should have an absolute power of disposition over every estate, legal or equitable, vested in him; (4) that a real representative should be appointed; (5) that estates for life and in tail (and we presume other interests now capable of being created at law) should remain capable of being created by way of trust. He observes that "abstracts of title would very soon be reduced to a series of short deeds of conveyance of a fee, or of a term, from one person to another, which would contain no recitals, and on which cases of construction could never arise." He also proposes that the legal fee should, in cases of settlement, be vested in the tenant for life, subject to a condition that he should be unable to make alienations, other than leases of a specified kind, without the consent of named persons *in esse*, who would really be the trustees of the settlement; and that, by a separate deed, the tenant for life should declare that he and his real representatives and assigns would stand seised of the land in trust for himself during his life, with remainders over. On the death of the tenant for life his real representatives would be bound to convey to the person next entitled in remainder. It appears unnecessary in this place to discuss the subsidiary provisions that Mr. Wolstenholme considers necessary to make the scheme work. It will be observed that this scheme is capable of being worked whether a system of registration of deeds or titles is, or is not, adopted.

Mr. Reginald Pearless advocates, in the *Law Magazine* for November, 1885, the adoption of a scheme in its essential points the same as Mr. Wolstenholme's, but he expresses some doubts whether it will be of any use.

(2) Mr. Hunter's Scheme.

Mr. Hunter's scheme, which will be found *in extenso* in 29 Solicitors' Journal, 782, is practically the same as Mr. Wolstenholme's, but he makes the following additional recommendations:—(1) That Crown debts, succession duty, &c., should be a charge in the hands of the owner only, not of a purchaser; (2) that dower and estates by curtesy should be a charge on the lands in the hands of the owner only, and not of a purchaser; (3) that no rent-charge under any statute should bind lands in the hands of a purchaser, unless registered; (4) to repeal the Satisfied Terms Act and enact that terms of years should only be put an end to by expiry, surrender, or ejectment; (5) that the period allowed for bringing actions for the recovery of land should be shortened to six years, and that all exceptions in the Statutes of Limitation in favour of the Crown, the Church, infants, and others under disability should be repealed; (6) that the Statute of Elizabeth against fraudulent conveyances should be repealed, and that gifts of real property should stand in the same position as gifts of personal property under the Bankruptcy Acts; (7) that the canon of construction laid down by the Wills Act that a devise by a testator of land transfer all his interest in it, unless the devise is in terms limited, should apply to deeds. He further suggests that a registry of deeds should be adopted, containing the usual particulars found in the Middlesex Registry, and that no assurance, will, order of court, or any statutory proceeding affecting land should have any validity till registered.

Both Mr. Wolstenholme's and Mr. Hunter's schemes should be carefully studied by any person interested in the reform of the land laws, as they contain most important remarks on the dangers and difficulties incident to any system of registration of title.

(3) Registration of Assurances.

The Statement says with great accuracy, "The institution of a registry of assurances has for its one specific object the security of title by means of the preservation of evidence." The mere registration of assurances will not shorten abstracts, it will not simplify the law, and it will not render it unnecessary to prove facts other than assurances—such as death or marriage—which affect the title, and it will not render it unnecessary to keep title deeds, and produce them to a purchaser or mortgagee. As many of our readers are familiar with the practical working of the Middlesex and Yorkshire Registries, we shall not explain them, but shall give some account of the Scotch Registry, which, in the opinion of the council, "appears to give general satisfaction."

An account of the Scotch system will be found in the evidence of Mr. Brodie, given before the Committee on Land Titles and Transfer in 1879, from which the following statement is abridged:—

In Scotland every deed which is intended to operate infeftment—*i.e.*, which passes the complete right to the land—has to be registered; but, until registration, it confers a personal right to the estate, though the owner can make another conveyance, which, if first registered, will be preferred; in other words, the instruments take priority according to date of registration; and persons are not affected by notice of an unregistered deed. The parties have the option of registering the whole deed, or an abstract of the deed. Where an abstract only is registered, the precise words of the part of the deed which is registered are followed. Formerly there were local registries, but now they are consolidated into a central registry at Edinburgh. As a matter of convenience, the register is divided into counties. There are two indices—an old index, consisting of an index of persons and index of places; and a new index, which was being introduced in 1879, which also served as a "search sheet," or index of what the register contains. The old index of persons comprises the names of both grantor and grantee, giving only their Christian and surnames, and a number referring to a corresponding number on the registered instrument in which the names appear. The old index of places in the same manner gives the name of the place and the number, but nothing further. Every name of a place mentioned in a conveyance is put into the index. If there be a parcel described, but no name given, it is treated exceptionally. The new index is called "search sheets." Each search sheet is a collection under one head of all the entries applicable to a particular land or property, and has separate indices both of persons and places—an index which differs from the old indices. The search-sheet index of names contains, not merely the names,

but also the designation of the parties, and a short description of the subject in the entry, as well as a reference by number to the entry; and the search-sheet index of places in like manner contains a short description of the subject, not merely the name. There is a system of official searches, a search being a statement in order of date of all the entries on the register having reference to the property searched against. An official certificate of the result of the searches is given out, so that on any subsequent dealing with the property all that is required is to continue the search from the previous search. The practice on sales is to intrust the vendor's deeds to the purchaser's solicitor for the purpose of examination, not furnishing any abstract except the search sheet, which is really an official abstract.

It will be observed that this system could not be applied to England without important changes in law as well as procedure; the whole law as to notice, whether express or implied from non-possession of the title deeds, and as to priority obtained by possession of the deeds, would have to be altered, changes which, we may observe, will probably have to be made if any system of registration of title is adopted. It should also be observed that the Scottish law of limitations differs from ours (see the evidence of Earl Cairns before Mr. Osborne-Morgan's committee).

(4) Blind and Speaking Registries.

Earl Cairns, in his evidence before Mr. Osborne Morgan's Committee, draws attention to the important distinction between a "blind" and "speaking" registry of assurances; a "blind" registry tells you that there are certain deeds in existence relating to the property, but it tells you nothing as to the contents of those deeds; the Yorkshire and Middlesex registries are blind registries. On the other hand, where the deeds are registered *in extenso* the registry is called a "speaking" registry; the Scotch registry is a speaking registry. He points out the different nature of the objections to the two classes of registers. In the case of a blind register, you must, in dealing with any particular property, find and inspect all the deeds on the register, most of which have nothing to do with that property. In the case of a speaking register you have the disadvantage of the publication of people's affairs, which, as we shall point out, gives assistance to fraud, and all the deeds on the register must be read through by a skilled person, as, until this is done, it is impossible to say whether the property is affected by them or not.

Probably, if registration of deeds is adopted, the system of search sheets might also be adopted with advantage, as it appears to obviate the frightful expense attending searches. We presume that the expense of a search against the Duke of Westminster or the late Mr. Cubitt in a registry for Middlesex, whether blind or speaking, would, under the present system, be prohibitory, while, if search sheets were adopted, no person would have to inspect deeds which did not affect the property in which he was interested, and the expense would be reduced to a minimum.

(4) Registration of Title after Official Investigation.

We now pass to the consideration of schemes for registration of title as distinguished from the mere registration of assurances. These schemes may be divided into two classes, according as the first entry of title on the register is made after or without an official investigation of the title. The former of these schemes was adopted by Lord Westbury, and embodied in "An Act to facilitate the proof of title and the conveyance of real estate." With respect to this Act, the Statement says:—

> "It is a matter of history that this Act was a failure, there having been registered under it, down to 1875 (when it was in effect superseded by Lord Cairns' Land Transfer Act of that year), less than 50,000 acres, of the total value of £5,200,000. The investigation and proof of the title, the strict evidence required by the registrar, and the local investigation of boundaries were all matters entailing great expense, and, withal, expense which brought no return to the landowner, inasmuch as it merely tended to save costs to a subsequent purchaser, who was not found in practice to consider that fact in determining the amount which he was willing to pay. Moreover, it invited an attack on the applicant's title (any technical flaw being sufficient to prohibit registration), and still more upon his boundaries. The delay, too, was excessive, many months (in some cases eighteen to twenty) elapsing before the registration could be completed.
>
> "In saying this, no reflection on the registrar is intended. The duty cast upon that functionary of a judicial investigation of the title, which was to result in finally excluding all other claimants without giving them any compensation, was an onerous duty, involving in its performance the utmost care and circumspection from a careful and conscientious man.
>
> "Notwithstanding the defects above indicated, many solicitors gave the Act a trial, but with general dissatisfaction to their clients, and the Act gradually lapsed into almost entire disuse, and was in effect superseded in 1875 as above stated.
>
> "In the year 1868 a Royal Commission was issued to inquire into the working of Lord Westbury's Act, and to report whether any change should be made in it. In their report, published in 1870, the commissioners treated the failure of the Act as thoroughly established."

Lord Cairns' Act of 1875 (a very full account of which will be found in the Statement) permits of registration with an indefeasible title, a qualified title, or a possessory title—in other words, after shewing to the registrar a perfect or imperfect title, or no title at law. The complete failure of both these Acts renders it probable that, for some time to come, no trial will be made of any scheme of registration of title based on a preliminary examination of title by the registrar. It is, however, right to say that Mr. Holt (of the Land Registry Office), in a letter to the *Times* last autumn, says, "I am convinced that all that is required to attain a most excellent system of registration of title is to make registration compulsory under the Land Transfer Act, 1875, on the basis of the scheme thereby established."

In our next article we shall discuss some of the schemes for registration without official examination of title.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE STATEMENT ON THE LAND LAWS.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—Referring to your review of the Statement by the council on the "Land Laws," and the expression of regret therein contained that the Statement has not been published, I am desired to inform you that it had been already determined to publish it through Messrs. Butterworths, of 7, Fleet-street. In the course of a few days prints may be obtained from that firm.

E. W. Williamson, Secretary.

Incorporated Law Society, U.K.,
London, W.C., Feb. 1.

SOLICITOR-EXECUTOR'S PROFESSIONAL CHARGES.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—The decision of Mr. Justice Chitty in *Re Barber*, that the clause enabling a solicitor-executor to charge for professional services gives him a "beneficial interest" within section 15 of the Wills Act, is a surprise to most of us.

But it is useful as calling attention to the rule requiring the testator's express direction to authorize a solicitor-executor in charging for work done by him in the executorship. A testator naturally selects a solicitor in whom he has confidence to be his executor, and, even where he gives him a legacy out of personal regard, he intends that all work done by the executor, where a solicitor is employed, shall be paid for out of his estate. Why does the law require an express clause in the will to give effect to this intention? If legal work has necessarily to be done, why on earth should it not be done and charged for by the solicitor in whom the testator has expressly shewn his confidence? Why, in the absence of express authority, should a solicitor, especially where he happens to have a partner, be required to do a lot of work for, perhaps, a large estate, without remuneration? It may be said that he can employ another solicitor to do the work, but that would defeat the object the testator had in view.

The clause enabling the solicitor-executor to charge has an ugly appearance, and I dare say many solicitors like myself find it distasteful to have to explain it to a testator; as it is telling him that the solicitor is asking to be allowed to do that which, without authority, the law says he shall not do. It is, as it were, asking a favour, and on that ground, if no other, the rule is highly objectionable.

Surely taxation is a sufficient protection. It would be well if the Council of the Incorporated Law Society would take the matter up, and get the vexatious and altogether unreasonable rule altered.

Maidstone, Feb. 1. John Brennan.

LAND REGISTRATION IN IRELAND

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—I have read, with much interest, your *precis* of the statement

of the Council of the Law Society on the subject of the Land Laws. As the registration of deeds, which forms an important element in the consideration of that question, is one in which, of necessity, I have considerable experience, and to which I have given some attention, I will ask you to allow me to make a few observations on this branch of the subject in your columns.

As I suppose you are aware, there is a registry of deeds in Dublin, established under statute (6 Anne, c. 2), in which all deeds affecting land in Ireland must be registered. Lawyers in Ireland are, therefore, familiar with the principles of registration, with which all our dealings with land are necessarily associated, and (I suppose on account of that familiarity) we do not entertain the apprehensions about the publicity registration gives to private affairs which seems to haunt our brethren in England. No doubt it is possible for the curious, on payment of a small fee, to ascertain whether their neighbour has mortgaged his estate; but, as a rule, we do not find the public inquisitive in this respect. Then, as to deeds of marriage settlement, the trusts are not usually disclosed upon the registry; so that inquiry there upon this—the most interesting subject to curious people—is in vain. There can be no doubt that the registry of deeds does give greater security of title, and, to our view in Ireland, dealing in landed property without such a registry, seems fraught with danger. If we are about to purchase or lend upon the security of land, after we have examined the abstract of title, we obtain, upon requisition to the Registrar of Deeds, an official certificate of search, which shews us all the registered dealings affecting the property, and if these dealings are explained to our satisfaction, we close the transaction; but without such a means of assuring ourselves of the state of the title we should feel quite at sea. You are right in saying that, as a general rule, the registry determines priorities; but, nevertheless, we have had many arguments and decisions on that subject in our courts of equity, sometimes arising from irregularities in the mode of registry, and sometimes from the question of notice.

I wish I could say that you were equally right in saying that registry is a security in the case of a lost deed. No doubt it ought to be so, and anyone reading the Registry Acts would naturally expect that they would have that effect; but, unfortunately, they have not been so interpreted by our Court of Chancery Appeal here, which has practically decided that an equitable depôsit of title deeds, if unaccompanied by any writing capable of registry, will take priority of a registered deed. The consequence is, that when a deed is missing, we are obliged to take the same steps as you would in England to protect ourselves against a latent lien upon it.

There is no doubt that, as you say, a registry of deeds adds to the expense of conveyancing, both in the registering of assurances and in the searches which become necessary; but as, in sales and mortgages, the scale of charges is fixed under the Remuneration Order, this is not now so material, and we think the benefits of registry are more than an equivalent to such expense. Many a title has been made out in Ireland, when all the deeds were lost, by a search in the registry, as, according to our system, you can search directly against the lands, without knowing the names of any of the parties who dealt with them, until you ascertain them by such search.

For the reasons I have mentioned, the operation of the Registry Act has not (although it ought to have done so) put an end to loans upon equitable deposit, such loans being largely made by the Irish banks (particularly in the country branches); but, in order to keep within the decision of the Court of Chancery Appeal in *Burke's Estate*, such deposits are unaccompanied by any writing.

I have occupied so much of your valuable space that I fear to encroach any further on it at present, but shall ask you, on some future occasion, to be allowed to make some observations on the relative merits of registration of deeds and registration of titles.

61, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin. HENRY T. DIX.

THE LODGERS' GOODS PROTECTION ACT.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—The decision in *Ex parte Harris* (34 W. R. 132) seems likely to give rise to a number of claims being made by persons who are not lodgers, but who, by setting out in the declaration only the absolutely necessary statements, may successfully escape being deemed "guilty of a misdemeanor." If A., who, though not a lodger, is the owner of the goods, makes a declaration that the immediate tenant has no right of property or beneficial interest in them, but that they are A.'s property or in his lawful possession, the landlord can only proceed with the distress at the risk of an action for illegal distress, which risk a landlord would, in many cases, not be willing to run; and he has no remedy in a criminal court against the declarant, if the declaration contains no statement (and it need contain none) that the declarant is a lodger. Surely a lodger should at least be required to state that he is a lodger, if he wishes to claim the benefit of a *Lodger's* Goods Protection Act, C. A. P.

London, Feb. 2.

THE LONDON MEETINGS OF THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

[We have received the following letter, which we print in fairness to the writer, but we hope it is hardly necessary to state that his somewhat offensive assumption that our article was either "inspired" or written by any member of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society is utterly unfounded. Neither directly nor indirectly was it so "inspired."

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—The appearance of an anonymous, but evidently "inspired," article in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL for the 23rd ult. on the Law Society Council and their opponents was well timed, being published immediately before the late general meeting, and, therefore, impossible for any answer to affect the voting at that meeting. As one of the minority therein referred to, allow me to make some remarks in reply. I am aware that the council give to the society much valuable time, but they are probably amply recompensed by the honour the society has conferred upon them. But whilst appreciating their services I think it is permissible to differ from them, and to discuss their line of action quite apart from their personal merits. Some members of the society—I hope not the council—are not ashamed to hint that we are moved by a love of factious opposition. It is not worth while to refute them, though it may be well to remind them that a *bonâ fide* interest in the affairs of the society is not confined to the council and their supporters. The minority has very good reason to believe that, though hopelessly outvoted at general meetings, a large section of the society, if not a majority, warmly sympathize with many of those motions which the council do not appreciate. At present the hour of meeting—2 p.m.—deters many; then, in a small assembly, the council, themselves not a few, are always supported by the club-men, who are indebted to them for a privilege, peculiar to this club, of a clubhouse rent and rates free; add to these the number of men who vote, as a matter of course, for the powers that be, and we have a sufficient reason to account for the smallness of the minority.

Let me recount some recent actions of the council. Until three or four years ago, with an utter disregard for public convenience, the hall and library were closed for several days in the busiest part of term for examination purposes. I frequently called attention to this, and brought forward a remedial bye-law, but was invariably opposed by the council. On the last occasion Mr. Pennington besought me not to press the matter as the society was too poor to hire examination rooms. Yet they have now silently abated the nuisance, and the hall and library are no longer closed. The *amour propre* of the council is respected, for a study of their reports would tend to prove that I was defeated; but, having practically gained my point, I am content to let the matter so rest. Here was an agitation, no doubt, but surely a useful and justifiable one.

About the same time Mr. Ford brought forward a motion about the old law club—he was defeated by ninety-six to ninety-five I think. The chairman refused a division, but on the next occasion, when the club-men became alive to their danger, the council ostentatiously proposed a division. There was no risk of defeat, though, had the interested club-voters been eliminated, it is safe to say that the council would have been hopelessly defeated. The club agitation continued. Mr. Ford brought an action against the council in respect of the club, but was ingeniously foiled, for the old club committed the happy dispatch, and immediately resuscitated itself under council auspices. It still exists, and is still unappreciated by the majority of the society. As both these agitations were persistent and successful, the council passed the "gagging" bye-law which I still hope to see repealed.

The writer of the article referred to alludes to "critics of items in the accounts." It is often improper for individuals to criticize single items; but it is needful to do so when "sundries" mount into hundreds, or when an item involving thousands ends with an "&c.," or when £500 to £600 are spent in plans for proposed extensions which are never carried out.

In 1884 I found that the council failed to enter a certain item in the receipt side of their account, and the president promised that the omission should not recur. It did recur in 1885, but the only explanation offered was, "we are all liable to mistake," an axiomatic reply which the council have not circulated amongst the members.

My other objections to the accounts are of a general nature. I allege that the council have three funds to administer, and that they ought, as other societies do, to render separate accounts of each—(1) the society's private income; (2) the registration fees; (3) the articled clerks' fees. Over these two last the Master of the Rolls and the Lord Chief Justice have jurisdiction, and I have, therefore, as intimated by the president on Friday last, addressed those learned judges upon the subject, stating the reasons why I venture to think that an inquiry ought to be instituted as to the manner in which the council expend and account for those funds, which amount to about

£14,000 a year. It would be unbecoming to say more on the subject, but I may add that I notified my intentions beforehand to the council, and, feeling that a general meeting is scarcely suitable for the discussion of accounts, I offered to place in detail the reasons for my views before the chairman of the Finance Committee, an offer which he, however, promptly declined.

Feb. 2. W. P. W. PHILLIMORE, M.A., B.C.L.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

COURT OF APPEAL.

In re GLANVILLE, ELLIS *v.* JOHNSON—C.A., No. 2, 4th February.

MARRIED WOMAN—SEPARATE ESTATE—RESTRAINT ON ANTICIPATION—COSTS OF ACTION IMPROPERLY BROUGHT.

The question in this case was whether the court has power to order the separate income of a married woman, which she is restrained from anticipating, to be applied in the payment of the costs of an action which she has improperly brought. The plaintiff, a married woman, was, under the trusts of a will, entitled to certain income for her life, the will directing the trustees to pay the income, as and when the same should should from time to time actually become receivable, and not by way of anticipation, into her proper hands, during her life, free from the control of her husband. In April, 1882, she, by a next friend, brought this action against the trustees, to administer the testator's estate, and to execute the trusts of his will. On the 19th of May, 1884, the action was heard on further consideration, and, by the order then made, it was declared that no default had been established against the defendants, and it was ordered that the next friend should pay the defendants' costs of the action as between party and party. The costs were taxed at £170. The next friend failed to pay them, and he became insolvent. On the application of the defendants, Bacon, V.C., on the 27th of November last (34 W. R. 118, *ante*, p. 92), gave the defendants liberty to retain their taxed costs out of the income of the plaintiff already accrued due and in their hands, and out of her future income under the trusts as it should from time to time become due and payable to her. It was admitted that the income which was in the hands of the defendants at the time when this order was made had accrued due since the date of the order on further consideration. The Vice-Chancellor, in making this order, followed the decision of Pearson, J., in *In re Andrews* (34 W. R. 62, L. R. 30 Ch. D. 159, 29 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 573), of which he expressed his approval. In *In re Andrews*, the married woman had sued without a next friend, and the action had been commenced since the Married Woman's Property Act, 1882, came into operation; but Pearson, J., did not found his decision on that Act. The Court of Appeal (COTTON, BOWEN, and FRY, L.JJ.) reversed the Vice-Chancellor's decision, holding that the effect of it was to anticipate the plaintiff's income, and that the court had no power to do this. COTTON, L.J., said that he was not quite certain whether Pearson, J., intended to decide *In re Andrews* with reference to the Married Woman's Property Act or not. But, in the present case, that Act must be entirely disregarded, for the married woman was suing as before the Act, by a next friend. There were two points—(1) whether the order was right as to the future income; (2) whether it was right as to the accrued income. A married woman having income settled to her separate use without power of anticipation stood in an anomalous position, which had been created by the Court of Chancery. The restraint on anticipation was intended to prevent her from using the power given to her to deal with the income as if she were a *feme sole* to her own prejudice. Although her position and rights in such a case were entirely anomalous, yet Lord Eldon and many other judges had said that the court, having asserted this position for a married woman, ought not to fail to give effect to it for her protection. Accordingly, even when a married woman had been party to a fraud, the court had declined to give any relief against her separate estate which she was restrained from anticipating. *Arnold* v. *Woodhams* (L. R. 16 Eq. 29) was an instance of this. The principle was that if a married woman could not by contract deal with her separate income, the court ought not in a case of fraud to do anything affecting the income to any further extent than she could herself. The order of the Vice-Chancellor was, therefore, wrong in principle as to the future income. In *In re Keane* (L. R. 12 Eq. 115) Wickens, V.C., held that a solicitor was entitled to a charge for costs on the separate income of a married woman which she was restrained from anticipating, but that was because he held that section 28 of the Solicitors Act of 1860 gave the court power to do so. The decision in *D'Oechsner* v. *Scott* (24 Beav. 239) turned on the peculiar language of the settlement, and did not apply to the present case. *Claydon* v. *Finch* (L. R. 15 Eq. 266) did not apply to future income. None of these cases justified the order of Bacon, V.C., and the Lord Justice could not agree with what Pearson, J., said in *In re Andrews*. It had always been held that the restraint from anticipation was a protection to a married woman inside the court as well as outside, and this was shown by the common form of judgment against the separate estate of a married woman, which was always limited to separate estate which she was not restrained from anticipating. With regard to the accrued income, his lordship did not wish to extend the protection of a married woman, and he did not doubt the power of the court to affect the income of a married woman accrued due before the act in question had been done. But here the order only affected income accrued due between its date and the date of the order on further consideration. In fact the wrongful act done by the married woman, which was relied on as the ground for ordering her to pay costs, was done once for all when she got the next friend to commence the action. The order was, therefore, wrong also as to the accrued income. BOWEN and FRY, L.JJ., concurred, both declining to express any opinion as to the power of the court in the case of a married woman suing without a next friend under the provisions of the Married Woman's Property Act, and also as to the power to affect income accrued due before the wrongful act had been done by her.—COUNSEL, *Russell Roberts; Chadwyck-Healey.* SOLICITORS, *R. Chapman; G. F. Robinson.*

In re WILSON—C. A. No. 2, 1st February.

LUNACY—PETITION FOR APPOINTMENT OF NEW TRUSTEES—BENEFICIARY OUT OF JURISDICTION—DISPENSING WITH SERVICE—VERIFYING CONSENT OF NEW TRUSTEE—R. S. C., DECEMBER, 1885, ORD. 38, R. 19A.

This was a petition in lunacy by three of four beneficiaries for the appointment of a new trustee. The fourth beneficiary was in Australia. The court (LINDLEY and FRY, L.JJ.) dispensed with service of the petition on him. They also held that the consent of the new trustee to act must be verified by affidavit, and that the new rule (rule 19a of order 38, *ante*, p. 141) does not apply to proceedings in lunacy.—COUNSEL, *T. J. Millar.* SOLICITORS, *Smiles, Binyon, & Ollard.*

FORD & SON *v.* THE METROPOLITAN AND METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY CO.—C. A. No. 1, 1st February.

RAILWAY ACTS—COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES TO PROPERTY DURING PROGRESS OF WORKS—RAILWAY CLAUSES CONSOLIDATION ACT, 1845, S. 6—LANDS CLAUSES CONSOLIDATION ACT, 1845, S. 68.

The main question in this appeal was whether the plaintiffs could claim compensation on the ground that their property had been injuriously affected during the progress of certain works which were being executed by the defendants under the powers of the Railway Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845. In 1879, the defendants obtained power to widen Great Tower-street, City, and for that purpose pulled down the side of the street from Mincing-lane to Mark-lane. Amongst the buildings affected by the works was a house, which consisted of three blocks, the middle of which was a one-storied building. The plaintiffs were in business in Glasgow, and, for the purposes of the sample department of the business, they became tenants of three rooms in the back part of the house for a term of seven years, at an annual rent of £180, under a lease which did not mention any right of way into the street. In fact, in order to get from the street to their rooms, the plaintiffs passed through a vestibule, and thence, by a staircase (which also led to their landlord's rooms), into a passage through the middle building to a staircase leading to their own rooms. The defendants pulled down the two front buildings, and constructed a temporary passage, so that the plaintiffs might still pass into the street. The plaintiffs claimed compensation under section 6 of the Railway Clauses Act, 1845, and the claim was referred to arbitration. Ultimately an award was made in favour of the plaintiffs for £600. In an action upon the award, the defendants alleged that the award was bad, on the ground that the arbitrator had exceeded his jurisdiction by giving compensation for the following heads of damage:—(1) Interference to business by the refusal of brokers and customers to call during the alterations, and their inability to find the premises; the difficulty of getting letters, due to the loss of a housekeeper, and the consequent return of drafts. The defendants contended that these heads of damage were too remote, being mere personal inconveniences due to the pulling down of the street generally, and not of the particular premises. The same objection was made to the 2nd and 3rd heads—viz., injury to the samples from smoke and dust. (3) Injury to the permanent value of the premises. On this point a surveyor gave evidence that the plaintiffs' rooms were now only worth £100, instead of £180, per annum. The defendants alleged that this was due to the works in general. (4) Want and pollution of water, and inability to light fire and gas. As to these, the defendants said that they were small temporary matters at once remedied by their engineer. (5) Loss of access. As to this, the defendants said that the plaintiffs had only a way of necessity to their rooms; that the landlord could have done what the defendants had done, as the temporary passage gave sufficient access. The defendants also denied that any part of the plaintiffs' demise had been affected by the works. The present question arose in an action on the award. The arbitrator was not called as a witness at the trial; but the plaintiffs admitted that the award included compensation in respect of injury caused to their property during the progress and before the completion of the works. Day, J., decided in favour of the plaintiffs, being of opinion that the way of necessity was in effect granted by the lease, and, therefore, that the plaintiffs' demise had been injuriously affected. The defendants appealed. The court (Lord ESHER, M.R., COTTON and BOWEN, L.JJ.) dismissed the appeal. Lord ESHER, M.R., said that it was true that, if the court could see that the arbitrator had given compensation for any matter in respect of which he was not entitled to do so, the award was bad. He regretted that state of the law, and wished that where it was clear that an item had been given in excess of jurisdiction, the court could not strike it out, and give judgment for that which was good. It was clear that compensation could not be given for mere personal inconvenience or injury to the business of a plaintiff. There must be injury to his property. There was no evidence on which the court could come to the conclusion that the arbitrator had exceeded his jurisdiction in respect of those matters. But it was said that, on the authority of Lord Chelmsford in *Rickett's case* (L. R. 2 H. L. 175, 16 W. R. H. L. Dig. 19), an arbitrator should confine himself to injury caused to property after the works had been constructed, and that the award would be bad if he gave compensation in respect of lands injuriously affected by works in the

course of construction. That was a most refined distinction, and it was doubted by Lord Cranworth in the same case, and by Lord Selborne in the *Caledonian Railway Co.* v. *Walker's Trustees* (30 W. R. 569, L. R. 7 App. Cas. 259). Therefore, that expression of opinion by Lord Chelmsford was not a binding decision of the House of Lords, and the court was driven to principle. He did not think that that refined distinction was law, and was of opinion that the mere fact that the arbitrator had given compensation for injury done to the plaintiffs' property before the works were completed did not make the award bad. Therefore, the action could be maintained, and the appeal should fail. COTTON and BOWEN, L.JJ., were of the same opinion.—COUNSEL, *Mellor*, Q.C., and *G. M. Freeman*; *Murphy*, Q.C., and *Bray*. SOLICITORS, *Birchells & Sons*; *Hodges, Irvine, & Co.*

SCOTNEY *v.* LOMER—C. A. No. 2, 28th January.

POWER OF APPOINTMENT—APPOINTMENT TO TRUSTEES FOR OBJECT OF POWER—MISAPPLICATION OF TRUST FUND BY TRUSTEE UNDER APPOINTMENT—LIABILITY OF TRUSTEE OF ORIGINAL SETTLEMENT—WILL—CONSTRUCTION—ABSOLUTE INTEREST.

This action was brought against trustees to make them liable for the loss of trust money. Under a settlement executed in 1849 personal estate was vested in trustees, upon trust to pay the income to S., a married woman (the daughter of the settlor), for her life, and after her death to hold the trust fund in trust for her issue as she should by will appoint. S. died in 1858, having, by her will, appointed two-fifths of the trust funds to H. and N., on trust to pay the income to her son W. until he should attain the age of forty, and, when he should attain that age, she directed that the fund should be held by her trustees in trust for W., his executors and administrators. Provided always, that it should not be lawful for W. to assign his share of the trust moneys or the income thereof (except by will), and that, in case he should do so, the appointment to him should be void, and the appointed share should be held in trust for the daughter of the testatrix. And she appointed H. and N. executors of her will. H. and N. both proved the will, but H. soon afterwards died. In 1866 L. and N. were appointed trustees of the settlement of 1849, and the trust funds subject to that settlement were transferred to them. In 1869 W. died under forty, having, by his will, bequeathed all his estate to B. and E. on certain trusts, and appointed them his executors. E. died in 1881. W. had not in any other way dealt with his appointed share. L. allowed N. to obtain possession of the funds representing the two-fifths appointed by the will of S. N. misapplied these funds, and became insolvent. The beneficiaries under the will of W. sued B., his surviving executor, for wilful default in allowing his two-fifths share in the trust funds to remain outstanding, and obtained judgment against him for the amount thus lost. The present plaintiff (who was the executor of B., who had meanwhile died) brought this action against L. and N., claiming a declaration that they were jointly and severally liable to make good the sum which N. had misapplied. North, J., held (33 W. R. 633, L. R. 29 Ch. D. 535) that the appointment of the two-fifths by the will of S. to trustees for W. gave him an absolute interest which passed under his will, and that S. had power to make the appointment to trustees for W., and the trustees of the original settlement were bound to hand over the fund to N. as the surviving trustee of the will of S., and L. was, therefore, not liable for allowing the fund to remain in the hands of N. The Court of Appeal (COTTON, BOWEN, and FRY, L.JJ.) affirmed the decision, but on different grounds. COTTON, L.J., was of opinion that the plaintiff must be taken to be suing as representing B., and on behalf of his estate. His lordship thought that W. took under the appointment an absolute vested interest, the enjoyment only being postponed till he should attain forty. It was not necessary to decide whether S. had power to make the appointment to trustees for W., so as to give those trustees the right to receive and give a discharge for the appointed fund. If she had no power to do so, yet, as the absolute beneficial interest was appointed to W., no objection could be raised to the payment of the money to N., if either W. or his representatives had consented to that payment, and the evidence shewed that B., as executor of W., had consented to the payment. The plaintiff, therefore, as representing B., could not now recover the fund from the trustees of the original settlement. BOWEN and FRY, L.JJ., concurred.—COUNSEL, *W. W. Karslake*, Q.C., and *S. Dickinson*; *Barber*, Q.C., and *Maidlow*. SOLICITORS, *Stocken & Jupp*; *Lambert, Petch, & Shakespeare*.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

WESTON *v.* NEAL—Bacon, V.C., 3rd February.

PRACTICE—NON-COMPLIANCE OF PLAINTIFF WITH ORDER TO PAY COSTS OF INTERLOCUTORY APPLICATION—APPLICATION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS MADE BY DEFENDANT ORE TENUS AT TRIAL.

This was an action for administration. When the action came on for hearing an application was made *ore tenus* on behalf of the defendant that the action should be stayed until the plaintiff should pay to the defendant a sum of £55, taxed costs which the plaintiff had been ordered to pay on the hearing of a summons taken out in the action. The case of *Re Youngs, Doggett* v. *Revett* (L. R. 31 Ch. D. 239) was cited on behalf of the defendant as an authority for the application to stay. For the plaintiff it was urged that it was too late to make such an application when the action had come on for trial. The summons in the action, on the hearing of which the plaintiff had been ordered to pay the costs referred to, was dated the 24th of November, 1884, and the taxing master's certificate thereon was dated the 24th of July, 1885; the pleadings in the action had closed on the 6th of June, 1885, and notice of trial had been given on the 6th of July, 1885. The defendant had made no application to stay proceedings till the action came on for hearing. BACON, V.C., said that the practice of the Chancery Division in staying proceedings under such circumstances had been recognized by Pearson, J., in *Re Youngs, Doggett* v. *Revett*, and he thought it was a wholesome practice. As regarded the objection that the application to stay was made too late, he thought the defendant was entitled to say that he was in daily expectation, up to the moment of trial, of receiving payment of the costs, and was therefore entitled to make the application to stay when the action came on for hearing. He would, therefore, make an order to postpone the hearing for a reasonable period until the taxed costs were paid. The plaintiff, however, thereupon paying the defendant in court the amount of the taxed costs, the trial of the action was proceeded with.—COUNSEL, *Marten*, Q.C., and *Charles Church*; *Horton Smith*, Q.C., and *Francis Webb*. SOLICITORS, *F. J. & G. Brackenridge*, for *J. B. & T. Knowles*, Burton-on-Trent; *Palmer, Eland, & Nettleship*.

Re CROOKE'S MINING AND SMELTING CO. (Limited), GILMAN'S CASE—Bacon, V.C., 31st January.

COMPANY—WINDING UP—CONTRIBUTORY—SIGNING OF MEMORANDUM—ALLOTMENT OF SHARES.

In this case a question arose whether, under the circumstances, a director and promoter of the company who had signed the memorandum of association for fifty shares, and afterwards applied for and obtained 100 shares, without stating that those already subscribed for were to be included in that number, ought to be put on the list of contributories for fifty shares in addition to the 100 allotted to him. BACON, V.C., said that after Mr. Gilman had signed the memorandum he was bound to take fifty shares, and he fulfilled his obligation by applying for a larger number. The company acquiesced in that and allotted him the shares. On the facts and the evidence it was clear that he could not be made liable for shares which he never took, and the application must be refused with costs.—COUNSEL, *Hemming*, Q.C., and *Phipson Beale*; *Marten*, Q.C., and *W. D. Rawlins*. SOLICITORS, *Clarke, Rawlins, & Co.*; *Davidson & Morriss*.

WILMOTT *v.* THE LONDON CELLULOID CO. (Limited)—Bacon, V.C., 28th January, 1st and 2nd February.

COMPANY—WINDING UP—DEBENTURE-HOLDER'S ACTION—DIRECTORS—FRAUDULENT PREFERENCE—COMPANIES ACT, 1862, s. 164.

In this case the question arose whether a debenture-holder suing on behalf of himself and all the other debenture-holders, except two of the defendants, and supported by the liquidator, who appeared separately, could take advantage of the 164th section of the Companies Act, 1862, which deals with fraudulent preferences, so as to make two of the directors repay to the company money which (it was alleged) they had applied in satisfaction of their own debts with knowledge of the insolvency of the company. BACON, V.C., said that the point was covered by *Ex parte Cooper* (23 W. R. 782, L. R. 10 Ch. 510). A debenture-holder could not take advantage of that section, which was intended for the benefit of all the creditors, without giving up his security for their advantage. The action, in that respect, was misconceived, and must be dismissed, with costs.—COUNSEL, *Millar*, Q.C., and *J. G. Laing*; *Bramwell Davis*; *Methold*; *Marten*, Q.C., and *Ribton*. SOLICITORS, *F. H. Heney*; *Lindo & Co.*; *E. Lee*; *Paterson, Snow, Bloxam, & Kinder*.

SERFF *v.* THE ACTON LOCAL BOARD—Pearson, J., 28th January.

EASEMENT—WAY OF NECESSITY—EXTENT OF RIGHT.

The question in this case was whether the defendants were entitled to use an old roadway, which had been used for agricultural purposes, on the ground that it was a way of necessity. The plaintiff was the tenant of some land under a building lease, and he claimed an injunction to restrain the defendants from using an old roadway or track known as Warple-way for the carting of bricks and other purposes connected with sewage works which they were constructing on a piece of land in the rear of the plaintiff's property. The board had acquired compulsorily, for the purpose of their works, about five acres of land—the reversion in the whole, from the reversioner; the interest in the plaintiff's building lease (which comprised a small part of the five acres) from him; and the interest in possession in the remainder from the tenant under another building lease. The part taken from the plaintiff was about half an acre. He required the value to be assessed by arbitration. The arbitrators differed, and it was referred to an umpire, who awarded £1,000 as the price of the tenant's interest in the half-acre and compensation for all damages, including future damages by reason of the land being injuriously affected. The plaintiff brought an action to recover the £1,000. The action was compromised, and £750 was paid for purchase-money and compensation, and the plaintiff conveyed his interest in the land to the board. The old track was about ten feet wide, and it had been used for the whole land at the back for agricultural purposes till the land was let for building. The defendants claimed the right to use the old road as a way of necessity for the purpose of constructing their sewage works. PEARSON, J., said that the law as to rights of way of necessity was not as certain and definite as could be wished. In *Gayford* v. *Moffatt* (L. R. 4 Ch. 133), Earl Cairns, C., adopted the law as laid down by Serjeant Williams (Wms. Saund., 321, n. 6), "So where a man having a close surrounded with his own land grants the close to another in fee for life, or years, the grantee shall have a way to the close over the grantor's land as incident

to the grant; for without it he cannot derive any benefit from the grant. This principle seems to be the foundation of that species of way which is usually called a way of necessity." The question was to what extent and for what purpose the right of way had been granted in the present case. The land was required for a particular purpose, and was sold for that purpose; and the deed of conveyance recited that the £750 was paid, not only for purchase-money, but for compensation for all injury and damages, as well present as future. His lordship came to the conclusion that the right of way was granted for all purposes for which it was required, or could be required, for the sewage works, and that, therefore, the board were entitled to use it for the purposes for which they had used it.—Counsel, *Crispe* and *Lawrence C. Jackson*; *W. W. Karslake*, Q.C., and *Pollard*; *M'Swinney*. Solicitors, *Edward Clarke*; *A. Hemsley*; *Venn & Woodcock*.

Re CAMPBELL'S TRUSTS—Pearson, J., 30th January.

Will—Construction—Bequest to Grandchildren—Per stirpes or per capita.

The question in this case was whether, under a gift to the grandchildren of a testator, the objects of the gift took *per stirpes* or *per capita*. The testator gave some houses to trustees, on trust to receive the rents and to pay the same equally to his son J. and his daughter A., during their lives; and, after the death of either of them, if there should be issue living of the first of them so dying, upon trust to pay one moiety to the survivor, and to divide the remaining moiety between all and every the child or children of the one so first dying; and, after the death of the survivor of the son and daughter, to sell the property, and divide the proceeds of sale equally amongst all and every the child or children of each of them, the said J. and A., who should attain twenty-one, in equal shares and proportions, to be paid at twenty-one. Pearson, J., held that the grandchildren took under the ultimate gift *per stirpes* and not *per capita*. And, there being one child of the daughter and eight children of the son, he held that the daughter's child took half the fund, and that the other half must be divided equally between the eight children of the son. He thought that the case was distinguishable from *Nockolds* v. *Locke* (3 K. & J. 6), because the property in the present case was houses (not stocks and shares); there was the word "equally," as well as the words "in equal shares and proportions"; and the whole of the income of a moiety of the property was given to the children of the child who died first, until the death of the survivor.—Counsel, *Method*; *Kenyon Parker*; *B. B. Rogers*; *C. Church*. Solicitors, *Briggs, Vaughan, & Briggs*; *Moodie & Miles*.

KER *v.* WILLIAMS—Kay, J., 28th January.

Practice—Striking out Statement of Claim—No Cause of Action—R. S. C., 1883, ord. 19, rr. 7, 27; ord. 25, r. 4.

This was a motion by the defendants to have the plaintiff's statement of claim struck out on the ground that it disclosed no ground of action. In July, 1885, the plaintiff issued his writ asking for a declaration that a certain agreement alleged by the defendants to be an absolute conveyance of the Sandown-park Estate should stand as a mortgage only for the amount of the consideration-money therein expressed, and for a declaration that the plaintiff and the defendants were, from the date of the agreement, partners and co-adventurers in the business and undertaking of the racing club and racecourse and other businesses carried on upon the Sandown-park Estate, and also for an account and a receiver. On the 16th of July, 1885, a motion was made before Kay, J., on behalf of the defendants, asking that the action might be dismissed on the ground that it was frivolous and vexatious, or that all proceedings therein might be stayed until the plaintiff should have paid the costs ordered by Bacon, V.C., to be paid by the plaintiff to the defendants in a previous action claiming similar relief. His lordship made an order staying the action so far as the relief sought by the indorsement of the writ was the same as the relief sought in the former action. This order was affirmed by the Court of Appeal on the 8th of August, 1885. The statement of claim delivered on the 13th of January, 1886, alleged that, in 1874, the Sandown-park Estate was purchased by and conveyed to the plaintiff and one J. Milward, the plaintiff being interested to the extent of three-fourths and J. Milward to the extent of one-fourth of the estate; that the plaintiff and J. Milward proceeded in partnership together, being interested in the shares as stated, to develop the estate and to convert into a race club, and expended large sums of money for such purposes; that the defendant, Owen Williams, in 1877 acquired the share of J. Milward in the partnership, and thereby became, to the extent of one-fourth share therein and in the partnership property, a partner with the plaintiff in the business. The statement of claim then claimed a declaration that the plaintiff and the defendants, O. Williams and T. A. H. Williams, or the defendants, the Sandown-park Club, were partners in the racing club and racecourse and other businesses carried on, upon, or in connection with the Sandown-park Estate, and that the plaintiff was entitled to the three-fourths share of the business and estate and other the assets of the club; a dissolution of the partnership as from the date of the writ in the action, and an account of all partnership dealings and transactions since December, 1884; a receiver, and an injunction. Kay, J., said that the case set up by the plaintiff in his statement of claim was totally different from that which he raised in his writ. A different partnership, and different persons, and different times were alleged. Even if the claim in the writ had not been altered, that would not have been a sufficient ground for resisting the application. It would not be good pleading for the plaintiff merely to allege the acquisition of the share by the defendant, O. Williams, and that he thereby became a partner. He should have alleged a contract by which the defendant, O. Williams, became a partner. It was said that the court ought to be lax in matters of this kind, but his lordship was not of that opinion. The statement of claim must, therefore, be struck out. The plaintiff could, of course, issue a fresh writ.—Counsel, *Kekewich*, Q.C., and *Jason Smith*; *Hastings*, Q.C., and *Godefroi*. Solicitors, *R. S. Taylor, Son, & Humbert*; *Gardiner, Hastings, & Co.*

GIRLING *v.* GIRLING—Chitty, J., 28th January.

Vendor and Purchaser—Middlesex Registry—Non-registration of Will—Testator's Heir unknown—Conditions of Sale—Suppression.

This was an adjourned summons in an action for the administration of the estate of a testator who died in 1875. It appeared that certain freehold property belonging to the testator, and situate in Middlesex, had been sold by order of the court. Amongst the conditions of sale was the usual one that no objection was to be made on account of any document not being registered in the Middlesex Deeds Registry. The will had never, or only recently, been registered. The testator's devisees were his illegitimate children, and it was not known who were the relations of the testator or who was his heir. The property was subject to a mortgage, but no inquiries on behalf of the heir had ever been made of the mortgagees or of the tenants. The purchaser objected that non-registration of the will was a fatal defect in the title, because, as he was ignorant who was the heir-at-law, he was unable to search in the Middlesex Registry for incumbrances made by him, and submitted that the defect in title was one which was known to the vendor, and could not be got rid of by a general condition which gave no information. *Edwards* v. *Wickwar* (14 W. R. 79, L. R. 1 Eq. 68) and *Heywood* v. *Mallalieu* (32 W. R. 538, L. R. 25 Ch. D. 375) were referred to. Chitty, J., said that the condition was the ordinary one. The description of the registry as a deeds registry was sufficient, although the document in question was a will. It was said that the facts were not properly set out in the condition, and that the condition should have stated the fact of non-registration of the will within six months. He, however, had never seen such a condition, and from inquiries he had made did not believe it to be a usual one. The purchaser must be taken to have had notice that there might have been a document such as a will, and that it might not have been registered within the prescribed six months. Of course if there had been a document registered by a purchaser from the heir the condition would not apply, but the purchaser had not shewn that that was so. The purchaser said that such a document was possible. No doubt that was just within the realm of possibility, and no more. The words of the condition covered the case, and nothing had been kept back. He therefore refused the application, with costs.—Counsel, *Reginald Hughes*; *J. M. Lloyd*. Solicitors, *Sutcliffe & Summers*; *Turner & Co.*

LANGWORTHY *v.* LANGWORTHY—P. Div., 2nd February.

Nullity of Marriage—Decree Absolute—Maintenance of Child—20 & 21 Vict. c. 85, s. 35—23 & 24 Vict. c. 144, s. 6—36 & 37 Vict. c. 31, s. 1.

This was a wife's petition for restitution of conjugal rights. The respondent by his answer denied the validity of the marriage, and prayed that it might be declared null and void. The suit was tried without a jury before the President of the Division, who held that there had been no valid ceremony of marriage, and pronounced a decree *nisi* declaring the marriage to be null and void, but directed that the final decree should contain a provision for the maintenance of the only child of the alleged marriage. More than six months having elapsed since the date of the decree *nisi*, the petitioner's counsel now shewed cause against its being made absolute until an order had been made providing for the maintenance of the child. It was argued that 20 & 21 Vict. c. 85, s. 35, gave the court full power to withhold the decree till an adequate provision had been made. On the other side it was contended that, under 23 & 24 Vict. c. 144, s. 6, which first enacted that a decree should be a decree *nisi* in the first instance, and which was extended by 36 & 37 Vict. c. 31, s. 1, to decrees of nullity, cause could not be shewn against making the decree absolute except on the ground of collusion or of the concealment of material facts, and *Patterson* v. *Patterson and Graham* (L. R. 2 P. & D. 102) was referred to. Butt, J., held that the court had power to insert in the decree absolute a provision for the maintenance of the petitioner's child, and that the present case was one where that power ought to be exercised; but he adjourned the case that the application for maintenance might be heard upon the merits.—Counsel, *Bayford*, Q.C., and *Innes*; *Inderwick*, Q.C., and *Middleton*. Solicitors, *Lumley & Lumley*; *Bircham, Drake, & Co.*

At the Bangor County Court on Monday, Judge Lloyd, during the hearing of an action, said:—"I must observe that there is hardly a single case heard in this court in which there is not deliberate perjury committed. Look at the last case—look at this frightful lying. I do not meet with such a state of things out of Wales. Other people have said this thing before, but hitherto I have kept quiet. During my whole life I have heard nothing to approach what it is in this part of the world. There is not a case heard in which people do not think it necessary to lie. It is most demoralising. I do not think it is in human nature to stand many years of it. I have had my turn of it. I appeal to every disinterested person to give his opinion as to what the feature of the country is. I can try in Cheshire ten cases while I try one here, because in Cheshire they do not lie."

SOCIETIES.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

A general meeting of the members of the Incorporated Law Society was held on Friday, the 29th ult., at the Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, the President (Mr. HENRY ROSCOE) taking the chair.

THE DEATH DUTIES.

Mr. MELVILL GREEN moved the following resolution, of which he had given notice:—"That, in the event of legislation being proposed as to any death duty, the council be requested to have regard to the fact that no other body and no section of the public is separately interested in the death duties, and that they be requested, therefore, to endeavour strenuously to have all details settled so as to remove all anomalies and injustice, and to create no fresh ones." He said that he thought the society would be thankful to him that he had put the notice upon the paper, as but for that they would have had an exceedingly unnecessary meeting. Whether any such legislation as that referred to in his motion would be proposed he did not know, but possibly events rendered it more probable that if there were any legislation referring to the death duty it would be more than ever necessary to take care that legislation was not actuated by passion rather than by calmness. He wanted to strengthen the hands of the council, and to encourage the council to feel that this subject, which was a great and important one, was one for their consideration. When a man had paid the death duty, whether it was just or unjust, he was not likely to do anything about the matter. He wished to forget it. He would not form an association to consider how the incidence of the death duties ought to fall, and so it followed that upon this question there was no public body interested, but only individuals who did not foresee the injustice of what was coming to them as legatees. The probate duty, as they all knew, fell not upon the beneficiaries of the entire estate, but upon the residuary legatees. The probate duty was fixed in amount by the total estate, and was borne by the pocket of the residuary legatee. When the probate duty originated it was only five shillings for the whole estate—a mere nominal duty—and it had grown up immoderately. When the last alteration was made the one per cent. duty which applied to children and their issue was abolished, and an increased probate duty substituted for it. In all fairness there ought to have been a provision that the residuary legatee under all wills made before the passing of the Act should be entitled to receive the one per cent. from all the legatees under the same will, who would have paid one per cent. but for the Act. It shifted the burden of the duty from one person to another most unfairly, but without anybody observing that it did it. That was the point he wished to make. He had given an illustration of this in the paper he had read at Liverpool. In his judgment the probate duty was quite unjust, and the proper duty would be one which would fall upon the beneficiaries and not upon somebody who happened to come in at the tail of the estate. It did behove the society to give their attention to the subject. The Act of 1853 was a perfectly new Act which had been very little meddled with, and the whole subject required to be dealt with in all its details by attention being given it by those who knew where the incidence of the tax fell, and there was no body of men but the council who were qualified to look to the public interest in the matter. Therefore he asked the society to strengthen the hands of the council by imposing upon them the duty of so doing when the subject arose. He should not suggest that the council ought to have looked to it when the probate duty was last altered, though it would have been well if they had done so, because, with the thousand subjects they had to deal with, he was not one of those who thought that the council should do a great deal more than they did. But he thought the members might, without casting any reflection, suggest to them that there were subjects to which their attention should be given, and solicitors should advise their clients as to the death duty. They should advise them in making their wills as to what the incidence of the death duties would be. The society formed the only body associated together who understood the ultimate incidence of the death duties, and it therefore rested upon them to take care that the House of Commons should understand the subject, and that proper amendments should be proposed, and that fairness should characterise the legislation.

Mr. ADDISON cordially seconded the motion. As representing the council perhaps he might say that they did not always succeed in obtaining what they wished when they proposed amendments in Acts of Parliament. Their suggestions were laid before the authorities, and occasionally they were adopted, but very often they were not. Therefore, although he quite recognised that the council should do what they could, he could not promise that they would be successful.

Sir THOMAS PAINE did not wish to raise any objection, but he thought the example of the incidence of taxation given by Mr. Green was not one in which he could concur. The subject was fully discussed at the time of the alteration of the probate duty, but they must bear in mind that there are a large majority of cases where those taking the residue are children, and that the exemption was in their favour. Where it was the case of a stranger he did not think they ought to object.

Mr. W. MELMOTH WALTERS said the matter had been under the consideration of the council, or certainly of individual members of it, before. And he held in his hand a very able letter, written by Mr. Dodds, M.P. for Stockton-on-Tees, to Mr. Childers in the year 1883. His (Mr. Walters) impression was that Mr. Dodds came to very much the same conclusion, but by a different road. The council were alive to these anomalies, but there was always this difficulty in interfering with fiscal questions—they were sprung upon them in the Budget. No one knew beforehand what the particular proposals were going to be, and before they could make any suggestions the thing became the law of the land.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN supported the motion, remarking that a very important letter by Mr. Hubbard had appeared in the *Times* of November last, showing that the incidence of these duties was very unfair indeed.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to say that the importance of this question has certainly not escaped me individually, for in my address at Liverpool I referred rather pointedly to these duties, and what was present to my mind was the great difficulty of ascertaining the incidence of succession duty, and the great inconvenience to the profession and also to their clients, sometimes by reason of the omission of payment of the duty, by which the duty was extended very often over many years; and I certainly think that, if the time comes for a reconsideration of these duties, it will be the business of the council to give their close attention to them.

Mr. GREGORY, M.P., thought that the question was, to a considerable extent, considered when the alteration was made in the duties, but he did not think it had received any very favourable consideration at the hands of the authorities. He thought he had mentioned the subject himself in the House of Commons, but he was not quite sure; but he was sure it was considered by the council and by other gentlemen who were interested in the question. He thought the whole question raised by the motion was a very proper one for the consideration of the council at any future opportunity. The council were the people to suggest alterations and amendments. Another matter had occurred to him and that was the length of time which was given to the Crown for making their claims in respect of these duties. Claims were made sometimes thirty or forty years after the duty had actually accrued. He thought that these things required attention, and it was very proper that the attention of the council should be directed to them. The council might give valuable advice and assistance, not only to the authorities but also to those who were competent to speak upon questions of this kind in the House of Commons, and he was sure that their representations would receive every attention.

Mr. PHILLIMORE said he had in his hand a case where the claim of the Crown was made after thirty years, and the claim might have arisen fifty or sixty years after, and the neglect of the parties to pay the duty was of a perfectly *bonâ fide* character.

The motion was carried unanimously.

THE CALENDAR—THE NEW CLUB.

The PRESIDENT read Mr. Ford's first question of which he had given notice as follows:—"Whether the reason for omitting from the Law Society's Calendar for 1885, the usual report of the proceedings of general meetings of the society for the preceding year, was the fact that discussions took place in the year 1884, followed by my action in the High Court, *re* the Law Club, and which ended in the winding-up of the club, and possession of the club premises being given to the society, and whether the council propose to include in the calendar for 1886 the usual reports of proceedings at the general meetings in 1885, and also a list of the members of the new club, names of hon. members of the club, the names of the club committee, and the club rules."

Mr. FORD was proceeding to address the meeting, when

The PRESIDENT said, I cannot allow you to make a speech: when you ask a question you must wait for the answer. If it is not satisfactory you can then call attention to it, but you must wait for the answer. Before I answer it I should say that we do not, for a moment, admit that the action of *Ford* v. *The Law Society* had anything to do with the alterations with regard to the club. What took place in the general meeting here no doubt had a great deal to do with it, but the action I do not think had anything whatever. But that is incidental—it is only imported into the question, but to pass it by might seem to admit its accuracy. Those parts of the calendar to which Mr. Ford refers were omitted solely because they are already printed and circulated in another form, and as the calendar has become already too bulky, we thought it a pity to repeat matter already in the hands of the members in another form. We therefore omitted it, and we propose to continue to do so. Then, with regard to the names of the members of the club, the names of the trustees, together with the rules of the club, are included in the calendar, but not those of the members. They are all members of the society. The club has a list of its own members. All members can, upon putting their names down and paying the recognised subscription become members of the club, but they are only members of the club as being members of the society, and not separately as members of the club. Then we come to another question of which Mr. Ford has given notice, as follows:—"Whether the council intend to give the new club twelve calendar months' notice, in the manner required by the resolution of the society of the 11th July, 1884, of the intention of the society to resume occupation of the club premises, in order that the same may be made available for the general purposes of the society, including luncheon and refreshment rooms, to be opened to all members of the society without further subscription, and with a view to affording further accommodation for law students; or, in the alternative, whether the council intend to call upon the new club to pay such a rental as the old club offered to pay on the eve of its dissolution." There again the question imports a certain fact which I do not recognise as being correct—that the old club did offer to pay a rental. It is quite immaterial, but we do not recognise it as a fact. I will answer the question. The old club was dissolved, and the new club established, since 1884, under the sanction of a general meeting. We do not, therefore, propose to interfere with it by giving the twelve months' notice. We do not propose to ask the club to pay a rent, because, at the very same meeting, we were directed to allow them to occupy the premises without rent.

THE BYE-LAWS.

The PRESIDENT said that Mr. Ford had given notice of the following motion:—"That the bye-law 17a is *ultrâ vires* the charter, opposed to free discussion, and is hereby repealed"; and asked the secretary to read the bye-law in question.

Mr. FORD asked whether it was in order to read the bye-law before he had moved the resolution.

The PRESIDENT said it would be convenient that it should be read.

The SECRETARY then read the bye-law, as follows:—"It shall not be competent for the president of or chairman at a general meeting of the society, without the express sanction of the council first obtained thereto, to allow any discussion to take place upon any matter, or to put to such meeting any resolution thereon, if it appears to him that the question raised upon such discussion or resolution has in substance been decided at any general meeting of the society held within the twelve months immediately preceding."

Mr. FORD said he would take the liberty of moving the adjournment of the meeting, in order that he might make one or two observations. He then referred to several matters, such as evening meetings of the society, &c.

Mr. DAY seconded the motion for adjournment. He thought it a very proper one. Mr. Ford had seen the coming cloud, and had given way before it.

Mr. GREEN said it would be a capital joke to take Mr. Ford at his word; but they had met to get through the paper of business, and they had better do so.

Mr. PHILLIMORE agreed that it would be a great joke to see the engineer hoist with his own petard; but he dare say Mr. Ford would trouble them with the same motions another time, so they had better hear him.

The PRESIDENT put the motion for adjournment, which was negatived.

Mr. FORD then moved the resolution which stood in his name, asserting that the bye-law put it in the power of the president to close the mouths of members. Indeed, it had been called by some members a gagging bye-law.

Mr PHILLIMORE seconded the motion, observing that the council had given two reasons for adopting the bye-law—one was the obnoxious question about the club, and he supposed his equally obnoxious proposition with regard to the inconvenience of closing the library during term-time. The council had seen fit to alter that. The council were competent to consider the legality of the bye-law, and he had no doubt that, if they did so, they would come to the conclusion that they were exceeding their powers.

Mr. H. E. GRIBBLE reminded the meeting that the motion for the bye-law was not brought forward by the council, but by independent members of the society, who felt that the right of discussion in that hall had been very grossly abused at that time.

Mr. J. R. MACARTHUR contended that the last speaker was wrong, for the reason that the resolution took effect immediately, which could not have been the case if it had not been moved by the council.

Mr. GREEN said the plea of *ultrâ vires* was not only unarguable, but ridiculous. There was nothing in the world which prevented free discussion so much as wasting time upon matters of little consequence.

Mr. FORD, in reply, was surprised that Mr. Lake and Mr. Addison did not correct the statements of Mr. Gribble.

Mr. LAKE: Mr. Gribble is perfectly right.

Mr. FORD, continuing, referred to Mr. Gribble as a paid assistant-examiner.

Mr. GRIBBLE rose to order. He did not mind Mr. Ford attacking him as a paid assistant-examiner, for the very good reason that he (Mr. Gribble) did not happen to be a paid assistant-examiner. It was just as well to mention this, as Mr. Ford was very fond of making remarks on many occasions with regard to what he attributed to paid assistant-examiners. He (Mr. Gribble) asserted that it was very bad taste to make these remarks.

The PRESIDENT was afraid that questions of bad taste were not points of order.

Upon the motion being put, seven hands were held up for it. There was a large majority against it. It was, therefore, declared negatived.

STUDENT'S FEES.

The following notice was on the paper:—"Mr. Charles Ford will move: 'That section 8 of the Solicitors Act, 1877, the terms of which, as regards the application of the students' fees named therein, are as follows:—"All moneys paid to the society in pursuance of this Act in respect of the preliminary, intermediate, and final examinations shall be applied by the society in payment of the expenses from time to time incurred by the society with reference to such examinations, and with reference to the lectures, classes, and other teaching provided by the society from time to time for persons bound, or about to be bound, under articles of clerkship, to solicitors," is not being complied with by the society as regards the application of the moneys therein mentioned.'"

Mr. FORD was about to move the resolution when

The PRESIDENT said: I have sought the advice of the council upon this question, and under the bye-law which was read just now you will see that no matter which has been discussed within one year from the time of the meeting at which it is proposed to be discussed again, may be brought forward if the president considers it should have been so discussed, unless by the express direction of the council. The council have directed me not to allow this matter to be discussed, and I must, therefore, rule Mr. Ford out of order. My reason for ruling the motion out of order is this, that at the July meeting of this society there was a motion made to refer back the accounts to the council and auditors on this very question as to whether or not we had properly applied the articled clerks' fund, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Macarthur I think. At all events, he spoke to it, and a very full discussion took place. The motion was no doubt rejected, but it did not make it the less true that the whole matter was discussed at the July meeting. I, therefore, rule it out of order.

Mr. FORD asked for the precise ruling.

The PRESIDENT: If you will read the bye-law you will see that if it shall appear to the president that a matter which is proposed to be discussed has already been discussed within a year, he shall not, without the express sanction of the council first obtained, allow it to be discussed. I asked the council whether they would wish to dispense me from my position, which is not a voluntary one at all. I am not allowed to have it discussed except they dispense me. They decided that they would not, therefore I rule it out of order.

Mr. PHILLIMORE, who was met with loud cries of "Chair" and "Order," said several times: May I point out—

The PRESIDENT: You must not. The matter is at an end. I would only add that Mr. Phillimore has himself brought this to the attention of the authorities—that is to say, the Lord Chief Justice and the Master of the Rolls, and, so far as I know, the matter is still under their consideration. Mr. Phillimore may or may not know more than we do. So far as we know, it is under the consideration of the Lord Chief Justice and the Master of the Rolls.

Mr. SPENCER WHITEHEAD asked if they were to understand that Mr. Phillimore had made some representation to the Lord Chief Justice and the Master of the Rolls with respect to it.

The PRESIDENT: I have reason to believe that has happened. A memorial has been sent to the Lord Chief Justice and the Master of the Rolls praying that the matter may be inquired into.

LEGAL EDUCATION.

Mr. FORD moved as follows:—"That the claims of the law students of England and Wales, advanced by them at their congress in London in June last, for a better system of legal education, deserve the serious attention of this society, and the council is hereby directed to report to the next general meeting of the society to what extent such claims can be met in view of section 8 of the Solicitors' Act, 1877, and this meeting is of opinion that greater inducements ought to be offered by the society to students in connection with the study of the law." He was proceeding to enter into the question of students' fees when

The PRESIDENT said: I am afraid you are importing the very subject I ruled to be out of order into your new motion.

Mr. FORD said it was absolutely impossible to argue the matter unless he was allowed to show the ways and means.

The PRESIDENT: We will admit there are plenty of funds available for all that can be reasonably done for the articled clerks, and we are most willing and anxious to do all that we can, and are doing so. Therefore you need not trouble yourself about the fees. If you will proceed to your argument as to what should be done, we will see about the funds.

Mr. FORD said it was impossible to go on if the president ruled what should and what should not be his arguments. If the president wished to close his mouth—

The PRESIDENT: I do not wish to close your mouth, but you are not entitled by a side wind to bring in all the arguments you had prepared upon the motion which I have ruled out of order. That was the only reason why I interrupted you. I offer to admit that we have funds so as to disembarrass your argument from any question of finance. This is not a financial question, this is a question whether or not we ought to do anything, and, if so, what more for the articled clerks. Do not import into it the question I have ruled out of order.

Mr. FORD resumed, declaring the present system of education was a miserable sham, and criticised severely the system of lectures and classes.

The PRESIDENT: Before the motion is seconded I should like to make a remark. I can assure you that the council did not take less interest than Mr. Ford in the subject, though they cannot altogether agree with him as to the best mode of affording the assistance which the articled clerks require. They do their best to work out or facilitate a scheme of education they consider desirable in any locality. Birmingham does something towards supplying law classes and lectures, and we give our assistance in a pecuniary way and also in the way of advice. We are now endeavouring to rearrange that system, inasmuch as it has not succeeded at Birmingham, owing, possibly, to the *personnel* of lecturers or some other reason. We are endeavouring to arrange a system by which the University of Oxford will undertake lectures. We also intend that Liverpool shall have law lectures, and shall be glad if inhabitants of large towns will come forward and ask our assistance To the best of our ability we are carrying out the object Mr. Ford has in view, although we are carrying it out by different means. Some years ago we sent to all the provincial law societies, inviting them to make suggestions with regard to the establishment of law classes, but we received very little encouragement; indeed, most of the law societies said there was no sufficient call for it in their neighbourhood, and that they did not see their way to give any assistance. Some did not take any notice, and others said that they thought it would be well if it could be arranged, but they did not carry it further. The bulk of them seemed to think that there was not sufficient demand. Of course you cannot force lectures and classes upon people who do not want them, and we find in London that these classes are not attended so well as they were, owing to a different system which has sprung up. The young men prefer to go to private tutors, or whatever they might be called, rather than to attend lectures and law classes. If that is their view, we cannot prevent it. If an actual demand arises for these lectures, we will do our best to supply it. We have established, during the last few years, a readership as well as lectureships, and Mr. Busk pays the greatest possible attention to the students, and acts more as a schoolmaster than as a lecturer. His classes have been very well attended, but often there is a difficulty to keep them up to the mark. Still, there is a tendency to turn away from classes and lectures, and with the best men we can get the tendency is in that direction.

Mr. CALDECOTT seconded the motion, remarking that he did not believe in the efficacy of lectures.

Mr. J. M. CLABON said reference had been made to a law university. He was one of two—Lord Selborne and himself—who were still in office, as it were, because they had a small fund of £300 or £400 still accumulating in consols. But he wished to remind them why the society for constituting a law

university was established. It was proposed that it should be a joint society of barristers and solicitors. Lord Selborne took a very active part, and there were several judges on the committee, and he (Mr. Clabon) was their treasurer. At that time the bar began to educate, and very soon they told the committee that they would educate themselves and would not have anything to do with the university. Why should the solicitors want a law university alone? He believed the council had done all that the law university could do.

Mr. GRINHAM KEEN had had the honour also of being a member of the executive committee with Mr. Clabon and Mr. Lake, of the Law University. The committee had worked very hard, and it was arranged that if there had been a governing board there should have been six solicitors and six barristers upon it; but it did not meet with general approval in high quarters and fell through. Under these circumstances the society had immediately started an honours examination, and matters were all now quite different from what they were, and if any question of a law university were to rise again the council would be prepared to go into it. But the arguments would have to begin *de novo*. The society had altered and improved their examinations greatly, and it was not fair to say that the council took no interest in the law university. They had taken very great interest indeed.

Mr. PHILLIMORE supported the motion, but said he did not altogether agree with many of the arguments Mr. Ford had advanced. He was in favour of extending the system of lectures if they could get the students to attend them; but students generally preferred private tutors. He thought the honours examination at the final examination quite enough; indeed, he was not sure whether it was not more than enough.

Mr. H. LOW expressed himself in favour of the council including the report asked for by the motion in the business of the next general meeting.

Mr. FORD having replied, the motion was put, when nine votes were given in its favour and a large number against. It was therefore declared to be negatived.

ANNUAL ACCOUNTS.

Mr. FORD had given notice of the following question:—"Whether, in the next annual accounts of the society, to be published by the council, the accounts relating to the Law Society Club will be included, as required by the charter and bye-laws."

The PRESIDENT: My answer is that they will not be included, because they are not required by the charter or bye-laws. Moneys that are expended by the club are not moneys of the society, but moneys of the individual members of the society who subscribe to the club. I need not go further than that. They are not moneys which the members pay for their admission to the society at all; but they are the moneys which they pay for their admission to the club.

PARTNERS OF MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.

The following notice stood on the paper of business:—"Mr. Ford will move the following as a bye-law of the society, with the view of preventing the appointment of partners of members of the council to the position of paid officers of the society: 'Partners or clerks of members of the council shall not be eligible to hold any appointment connected with the society, in regard to which remuneration out of the society's funds attaches.'"

Mr. FORD, in moving the resolution, remarked that since he had given notice he was sorry to find that a partner of their learned and excellent president happened to be one of the paid assistant-examiners of the society.

The PRESIDENT: Oh, yes; he has been so for many years.

Mr. FORD said he moved the resolution in the best interests of the society, and did not think that the interests of the society were promoted by the existing state of things.

The PRESIDENT: Don't consider my feelings, Mr. Ford, in the least.

Mr. FORD asked the council in a kindly, friendly spirit to adopt the resolution, and advertise these valuable appointments, as other professions did.

Mr. ELLISON rose to order. He objected that the members, as professional men, should have their business time wasted in this manner. They could not hear a single word of Mr. Ford's remarks.

The PRESIDENT: But a man is not out of order by being inaudible.

Mr. MACARTHUR seconded the motion.

Mr. GRIBBLE thought the motion a very improper one. It was a motion which could not be supposed to reflect the slightest discredit on the council, but it was a very great insult to the society, in his opinion, to have these motions continually brought forward with the insinuation which was contained in them that the council would select gentlemen with any preference whatever simply because they happened to be their partners or their clerks. He thought that by bringing forward these motions Mr. Ford was lowering himself, and so far as he had any influence in the society or his name was connected with the society, he was lowering the society. He (Mr. Gribble) would be very glad to hear a strong expression of opinion to the effect that these very improper motions ought not to be brought forward. Having had the honour of acting until lately as an assistant-examiner in the society for some years, he was personally able to bear witness to the great pains the council always took to select the gentlemen whom they appointed to that honourable post, and he might also say that some gentlemen applied constantly for it and did not get appointed. The task of selection was invariably a difficult one, and it was not rendered easier by such a piece of impertinence—he called it no better—as this motion.

Sir THOS. PAINE said he had been for a dozen years an active member of the Examination Committee. All he could say was that he would never vote for a partner or clerk of a member of the council if he did not think him the best man. But if other things were equal, and the question was between a partner or clerk and one who was not, he would probably, in nine cases out of ten, vote for the one who was not. But experience had shown that some of those who had been selected from the firms of which the members of the council were partners had been the best of examiners. He would be sorry to be deprived of them for that reason. He had neither a partner nor a clerk who was an assistant-examiner, and never had.

Mr. FORD having replied, the motion was put, when seven votes were given in its favour, and a large majority against.

A vote of thanks to the president, moved by Mr. FORD, and seconded by Mr. DAY, terminated the proceedings.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

At the usual monthly meeting of the directors, held at the hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, on Thursday, the 4th inst., the following being present—viz., Mr. Sidney Smith (chairman), and Messrs. Hedger, Nisbet, Scadding, Williamson, and A. B. Carpenter (secretary)—a grant of £25 was made to a member, and the ordinary general business was transacted.

WORCESTER AND WORCESTERSHIRE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the above society was held at the Law Library, Pierpoint-street, Worcester, on the 27th ult.—present, Mr. F. Corbett, president, in the chair; Mr. J. H. Whatley, vice-president; Messrs. T. G. Hyde, T. Southall, J. Stallard, jun., W. Allen, R. P. Hill, W. W. A. Tree, A. J. Beauchamp, T. Roberts, E. Nevinson, E. A. Davis (hon. treasurer), and F. Ronald Jeffery (hon. secretary).

The report of the committee for the year ending the 31st of December, 1885, and the treasurer's accounts, were received and adopted, and the following officers of the society were elected for the ensuing year:—President, Mr. Frederick Corbett; vice-president, Mr. Joseph Higgins Whatley; hon. treasurer, Mr. Edward Amphlett Davis; and hon. secretary, Mr. Francis Ronald Jeffery; auditors, Messrs. G. Clarke and H. Goldingham. The following gentlemen were appointed members of the committee—viz., the president, vice-president, hon. treasurer, and hon. secretary; and Messrs. G. W. Bentley, W. P. Hughes, T. G. Hyde, T. Southall, and J. Stallard, jun.

The following are extracts from the report of the committee:—

Members.—The present number of members of the society is sixty-one, being the same number as last year.

Expenses of Advertising Statutory Notices under 22 & 23 *Vict. c.* 35.—The committee have had under their consideration the high and varying charges made for the insertion of these notices in the local newspapers, in some cases amounting to 27s. for each insertion. Your committee entered into communication with the local newspaper proprietors on the subject, and are glad to be able to state that the proprietors of the leading Worcester newspapers so far fell in with their views as to be willing to insert future advertisements of this description at an uniform charge of 17s. 6d. per insertion, the space occupied not exceeding three inches. This space, your committee consider, will be sufficient for all ordinary cases.

Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, 1883.—The committee are glad to state that, in April last, they received the report of the Special Committee of the Incorporated Law Society appointed to report upon the proper practice with reference to the appropriation of the statutory poundage on levying distresses for rent upon agricultural holdings. It will be in the recollection of members that this special committee was appointed in consequence of an application by this society to the Council of the Incorporated Law Society for their opinion on the subject. As a result of the investigations of the special committee, the Council of the Incorporated Law Society advised that, in their opinion, bailiffs were not entitled to the percentage allowed by the Act of £3 per cent. on sums exceeding £20 and not exceeding £50, and of £2½ per cent. on sums exceeding £50; but that such percentages were applicable for payment of the general costs of the distress. The council have since taken up a test case and obtained a decision of a county court upon the construction of the Act upon this point. The committee have ascertained that in this, and also in another case, the county court judges have held that the landlord is entitled to the before-mentioned percentages towards the general costs of the distress.

Bankruptcy Act, 1883.—Your committee considered the report of the Committee of the Incorporated Law Society on the Bankruptcy Act and Rules, 1883, together with the scale of costs proposed by them, of which they approved, subject to certain amendments. The president of the society attended a meeting of the Associated Provincial Law Societies, held on the 27th of February last, to consider the report and suggested scale, and, at this meeting, the suggestions and alterations made by your committee were adopted. The Incorporated Law Society's report and suggested scale of costs have since been communicated to the Lord Chancellor and the President of the Board of Trade. The committee have also, in response to a letter received from the Huddersfield Incorporated Law Society, passed a special resolution advocating such an alteration of the existing rules as would enable creditors to give general proxies to solicitors ordinarily acting for them, and expressing their willingness to join in a deputation to the Lord Chancellor or Board of Trade with that object.

Trustees Relief Bill.—The committee approved of the provisions of the above Bill, subject to a slight alteration in the interpretation clause, excluding mining and manufacturing property from being included under the term "house property." The Bill dealt with the question of the proper proportion of the sum advanced to the amount of the value of the property intended to be mortgaged in trustees' investments on land and houses, and contained provisions to enable trustees to advance money

leaseholds without investigating the landlord's title, to sell under general conditions of sale, and to authorize solicitors to receive purchase or mortgage moneys on their behalf. Having regard to the recent case of *Fry* v. *Tapson* (51 L. T. Rep. 326), with regard to trustees' investments, the case of *Dunn* v. *Flood* (54 L. J. Ch. 370), with regard to depreciatory conditions of sale, and the case of *In re Bellamy* (L. R. 24 Ch. D. 387), with regard to solicitors of trustees receiving purchase moneys, it seems to the committee eminently desirable that the much-needed provisions of this Bill should at the earliest moment become law.

Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom.—The committee have received a circular from the above society specially calling attention to the great desirability in the common interests of the profession of increasing the number of members of that society. Your committee feel that, in order to increase the power and usefulness of the Incorporated Law Society, it is of great importance that it should be made as completely representative of the whole body of the profession as is possible. Holding these views your committee would strongly urge all those members of this society who have not already done so to also become members of the Incorporated Law Society.

BIRMINGHAM LAW SOCIETY.

The following are extracts from the report of the committee:—

Members.—The number of members is now 235, being six more than last year. Sixteen have been added, but we have lost ten as follows:—By death four; by removal of name under provisions of the articles of the association six.

Preliminary Examinations.—During the year four examinations have been held in Birmingham, and Mr. C. T. Saunders has supplied the following information, which shows a very much larger proportion of failures than for many years past:—February, Charles Frederick Brown and William Showell Rogers examiners; total number, 16; number passed, 12; number failed, 4. May, Henry Parish and James Hargreave examiners; total number, 9; number passed, 6; number failed, 3. July, Frederick Sydney Goodwin and Henry Glaisyer examiners; total number, 22; number passed, 5; number failed, 17. October, Alfred Canning and Benjamin Shirley Smith examiners; total number, 10; number passed, 7; number failed, 3. Totals—Total number, 57; number passed, 30; number failed, 37.

Law Classes.—These classes have been continued during the past year, but the attendance, though much the same as last year, has not been very encouraging. Prizes were offered as in previous years, namely—the president's prize, of £5 in each class, won by Mr. Arthur Smith in the senior class, and by Mr. A. J. Raybould in the junior class; and a second prize in each class of £2 2s., one given by Mr. C. T. Saunders and the other by the late Mr. James Marigold, won by Mr. A. E. Aldington in the senior class, and Mr. R. A. Rotheram in the junior class. The committee have thought it best to terminate their engagement with Mr. Emmott, and are happy to report that they have secured the services of Mr. Thomas Mott Whitehouse, a barrister practising in London, who they believe to be well fitted for the work. Mr. Whitehouse will commence his lectures on the 3rd of February, and will take two classes as before. The committee most sincerely hope that the members will take the matter up warmly, as without their support the scheme of law classes must fail.

Incorporated Law Society.—The attention of the committee has been called by the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom to the desirability in the common interests of the profession of increasing the number of members of their society. Out of the total number of the members of our society, only 104, or considerably less than half, are members of the Incorporated Law Society, and the committee submits for the earnest consideration of those of our members who are not already members of the Incorporated Law Society, that they should lose no time in getting themselves elected. The honorary secretary will be glad to render any assistance in his power.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council resumed their sittings on Tuesday. Their first list contains 19 appeals, including three from Bengal, two from New South Wales, three from South Australia, two from the North-West Provinces, two from Canada, two from Natal, and one each from Oude, Burmah, China, and Japan, Cape of Good Hope, and Victoria.

A Country Solicitor wrote to the *Times* as follows:—"Having a cause for trial in the Queen's Bench Division, I to-day accompanied my client to the court. After the trial was over, as we were leaving, an usher came up to me and asked to be remembered. I put him off, but he followed into the corridor and said, 'I hope you will not forget me now you have won your cause.' I replied, 'If there are any fees to pay my London agent will see to it.' Upon that the man left me, but on my turning round after speaking to my counsel I saw he had followed my client and had extracted from him a coin, which he was just pocketing. This, I think, should not be allowed." On the appearance of this letter Lord Coleridge wrote to the *Times*:—"My attention has been called this morning to a paragraph, which escaped me at the time, in your paper of the 29th, imputing very grave misconduct to one or more of the ushers of the Queen's Bench. I hope I need not say that such conduct is not only contrary to rule, but that the ushers know that if discovered it will be followed by the heaviest penalty in my power to inflict. It is not, however, possible for the Chief Justice to know of these things if he is not informed of them, and I write these lines to ask you to allow me to inform the public through your columns that I desire to have such things made known to me, and that when made known they will be, I hope, promptly and effectually dealt with."

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

Intermediate Examination.

The following candiates (whose names are in alphabetical order) were successful at the Intermediate Examination held on the 14th of January, 1886:—

Allen, Reginald Lloyd
Askren, James Harnew
Atherton, John Augustus
Barber, Harry
Batty, Joseph
Bell, James
Blake, Garson Henry Lovewell
Blount, Ernest William
Booth, George Arthur
Brandon, Harry
Briggs, John Morley
Broadbridge, Walter Cyrus
Brown, Herbert Collander
Burnett, Robert Oldham, B.A., LL.B.
Butcher, Robert Symonds
Butler, Charles Shirley
Carpenter, John Sydenham
Charlton, Ernest Edwin
Charlton, Oswald
Charsley, Arthur Edmund Webster
Chinn, Richard
Clarke, Edward Warren
Claypole-Smith, William Sidney
Clegg, Leonard Johnson
Clemence, Herbert
Clowes, Albert Frank
Cooke, Alfred Hindley, B.A.
Cooper, Durrant Henry
Copnall, Henry Hampton
Cork, Robert Charles
Court, William Henry
Crossman, Alexander
Crowe, Edmund George
Cumming, Hugh William Henry
Cummings, Arthur Temple
Dain, Henry Bennett
Day, Charles Gregory
Day, Herbert William
Dixon, James
Drury, Aubrey, B.A.
Dunkerton, Henry Percy
East, Frederick John
Edwards, William George Albert
Ellison, Frank
Ellison, John
Evans, William, B.A.
Fort, George Henry
Foster, Walter Henry, LL.B.
Francis, Earley Christopher, B.A.
Glascodine, Richard Walter
Goold, Athelstan
Guthrie, Thomas Robinson
Hacking, James Wrightson
Halliday, Alfred
Harbord, Arthur Taylor
Harris, Charles Frederick
Heap, John Edward
Hibbert, Samuel Arthur
Higson, William Rigby
Holmes, Thomas Henry
Hudson, Albert Edward Rose
Huskinson, Charles John
Inglis, Andrew Glover
Isaacson, Martin Sylvester
Izod, Henry Allan
James, Ebor Riley
Jobson, John
Johnson, Robert Graver
Jourdain, Albert Edward Towle
Kaye, Walter Thoroton, B.A.
Knight, Benjamin Charles
Knight, Percy Wilton
Knowles, Jonathan
Leather, Francis Holdsworth
Lewis, Harry James
Lister, Edward Haley
Loy, Thomas Nicholas
Lucas, William Bernard
Margrave, Robert
Marsh, Alban Bower
Maybery, David Joseph
Mayne, Arthur Heriot
Mayson, Frank
Miller, Frederick William
Milward, Victor Graham
Moorhouse, John Chester
Morgan, John Austin
Mote, Henry William
Neale, Edward James
Nesbitt, Charles
Newton, Oliver
Nicholls, George Fraser
Norris, William Buffton
Norton, Edwin Charles
Osland, Christian
Padley, George Frederick
Parkin, Agar Hooper
Payne, John Bertram
Pease, Percy Duncan
Pepper, William Ernest
Pinch, Frederick William
Price, John
Purchase, Francis Habin
Richardson, Harry Leo Sidney, B.A., LL.B.
Rigden, William Attwood
Roberts, Richard Mostyn
Roberts, Tom Hartley
Rylands, Richard Walter
Samuels, Samuel Ormes
Scott, Stanley Herbert
Sheppard, Edward Garside
Sinclair, Norman Macleod, B.A.
Slater, Samuel Mills, B.A.
Slipper, Armene Hugh
Smith, Charles Ewbank
Smith, Harry Hall
Soames, Edgar, B.A.
Spencer, Charles St. David, B.A.
Sprott, William Taggart
Sutcliffe, John Herbert
Swinburne, Henry, B.A.
Sykes, Edmund George
Tackley, Charles Adolphus
Thomas, Arthur Russell
Thomas, William
Thornely, James Lamport
Tooth, Adolphus
Treasure, William Houston
Trimmer, Charles Henry
Tudor, Owen Lechmere
Tweed, Edward Ernest
Walker, Arthur
Ward, William
Watts, Henry Moore
Webb, William Herbert
Wheeler, John Cornelius
Whytehead, Godfrey Yates
Williams, William Addams
Wolverston, Harold
Wykes, Sidney Robert
Yewdall, Charles Edward

Final Examination.

The following candidates (whose names are in alphabetical order) were successful at the Final Examination held on the 12th and 13th of January, 1886:—

Adams, Hugh
Addision, John Joseph
Akerman, Portland Board
Alcock, William Edward
Aldridge, Henry George Randall
Alexander, Charles Rootes
Ancrum, Sydney Rutherford, B.A.
Awdry, John Pinniger
Ball, Alfred
Bancroft, William

Barton, Tinley Wallace
Bastin, Edward Matthews
Beevor, Thomas Preston
Bell, Francis Henry Augustus
Bigg, Henry Pridham
Billson, Frederick William
Bowie, David Mather
Britton, Philip William Poole
Burrell, John Joshua
Chambers, James William
Chapple, Frederic Northcote
Chapple, William Edwin Pitfield
Charlesworth, George Herbert
Charlton, William
Cheriton, Frank
Christie, Thomas Delamare
Churchman, Henry Eade
Clapp, John Tucker, B.A.
Clark, Eustace Frederick, B.A.
Clay, John Edward
Collyer, George Alexander
Conder, Caleb William
Cook, Robert
Cook, Walter
Cooke, Henry Paget
Cooper, Frederic Ernest
Creak, Robert Henry Herbert
Crickitt, Tom Shelton
Crook, Francis William, B.A.
Cross, George Young
Cufaude, John
Cummings, John William
Currey, George Evelyn
Daish, John Henry
Dalton, James
Davies, Frederick William
Davies, John Wallis
Davis, Edward Walter
Davis, Luther
Dawe, William Henry Tremlett
Dawson, Charles
Denison, Herbert
Denton, Charles Edward
Dixon, Richard Cecil William
Dod, Sidney Williams
Dowling, Edward, B.A.
Drake, Edward Herbert
Drew, Albert Francis, LL.B.
Evans, Goronwy Maelor
Evans, William Wynn
Fenn, John
Firth, Arthur
Fletcher, Edward
Forrest, Alexander Reynolds Cripps
Foster, Hedley Turner Plimsaul
Foster, William Arthur
Foulkes-Jones, Lewis
Fox, George Castle
Fox, John Robert
Freeman, Charles Robinson
Geddes, David James
Gee, Thomas
Gibson, Jasper
Goode, Thomas Henry
Goodford, Henry Frank, B.A.
Gover, Frank
Gowland, Frederic Stockton
Groome, Alfred
Guthrie, Robert Tynemouth
Gwynn, Gronow Gaches
Hall, Henry Tansley, B.A.
Hall, Reginald Tudor, B.A.
Harding, William
Hargrove, William Wallace
Harries, Henry Frederick William, B.A.
Hart, Edwin
Hart, Robert Pulsford
Haslehurst, George Lister
Henstock, Albert John
Hibbert, Arthur James
Hill, William Coggan
Hillman, Harold
Hirst, George Harry
Hocking, Edwin Gilbert
Hodges, Henry St. John
Holbrook, Walter
Holmes, Arthur
Holroyd, Frank
Holt, Frank
Homewood, Wilfrid James
Hopgood, John Edgar
Horton, Joseph
Humphreys, Edward Lewis
Huntbach, William
Ireland, Henry Cubitt
Jackson, Francis Joseph
James, John Neville
Jellicoe, James Anthony
Johnson, Alexander William
Johnstone, Harry Spearman
Jones, Daniel
Jones, David
Jordan, Harry Hewitt
Keating, Arthur Richard
Keep, Ernest Edward, B.A.
Kelly, Reginald
Kent, Hugh Bulkeley
King, William George
Knocker, Edward Pemberton
Leaf, Frederick Walton, B.A.
Ledward, Edward Harris, B.A.
Lee, Henry, B.A.
Lewis, William Edgar
Locke, Francis Alexander Sydenham
Lynex, Alfred Richard
McMillan, Donald
Mann, Frederick William
Margetson, Leonard Charles
Marris, George
Marsh, Percy
Martin, Hugh Alexander
Mason, William Henry
Mawdsley, Thomas Ryder
Meadmore, John Anlaby
Medcalf, Daniel
Milner, David Morton
Moeran, Edward Joseph, B.A.
Moir, Charles Forbes
Money, Douglas Walter
Montague, Frederick Florence
Nelson, Herbert Walter
Nelson, William Wooding
Newborn, George Hope
Newton, James Walkden
Nicholas, John William
Nichols, George Aplin
Nicholson, Henry Tinklar, B.A.
Noel-Cox, Herbert Lovis
Norris, George Withington
Pain, Ernest Edwin
Palmer, Arthur Maurice
Paterson, William Vautier, B.A.
Paul, Percival
Paull, James Philip
Payne, Edwin Rowland
Pearse, Thomas Vincent
Pearson, Ernest Braden
Pepper, Francis Henry
Pickering, Percival John
Powell, Frederick Nelson
Powell, Owen Markham
Preston, Harry Westbury
Radcliffe, Reginald Heber
Ramsden, Walter
Redfern, Theodore
Rees, Wyndham
Ridge, Samuel
Ridley, Frank
Robinson, Frederick
Robinson, Robert Wiswall
Rowe, Stephen
Rowland, William Jorwerth
Salter, Thomas
Simmons, Harry John Sefton
Sharples, James Bolton
Sheffield, Herbert
Shelswell, Henry Samuel
Smith, Arthur Berks
Smith, Frederick Robert
Smith, William Saunders
Smith, William Symons
Soames, Charles Edward, B.A.
Spencer, Frederic William
Squires, Henry Charles
Stanton, John Harrison
Stead, John Walter
Stevens, Frederick
Stewart, Frank, B.A.
Strachan, Walter
Strong, Charles Herbert, B.A.
Suddaby, Bedall
Taylor, John
Thomas, John
Thomas, John Llewelyn Pugh
Thompson, George Gilbert
Thornton, Swinford Leslie
Tidy, Edgar Whitworth
Trevor, Charles Milner
Turnbull, John
Turner, Charles Hastings
Turner, George Holborn
Tweed, Ralph Egerton
Vaughan, Walter John
Wadeson, Richard Harman
Walker, William Wright
Walpole, William Henry
Watson, Thomas Rouse
Watts, Frank
West, John Henry
Westbrook, George John
Wigham, John Harper
Willcocks, George William Hamilton
Williams, Francis Arthur Egerton
Williams, John Davies
Wilson, John Baty
Windsor, Walter Edward
Wing, John Sladen

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

The usual weekly meeting of the society was held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, on Tuesday, the 2nd inst., Mr. W. E. Elmslie being in the chair. Before proceeding with the subject appointed for debate, Mr. Spiers brought forward a motion of which he had previously given notice—namely, a vote of congratulation to Sir William Grantham, a past member of the society, upon his elevation to the bench, a motion which was agreed to unanimously, and afterwards ordered to be communicated by the secretary to his lordship. The society then proceeded to the debate upon the Queen's Speech, which it was found had not, by recent events, lost any of its interest, but, indeed, provoked a warm contest and brought together a larger attendance of members than has taken place for some time. The debate was opened in favour of the Government by Mr. Lloyd Jones, who was supported by Messrs. Duke, Bilney, and Goodheart, and opposed by Mr. T. B. Napier. It having by this time grown very late, the debate was, on the motion of Mr. P. T. Rhys, adjourned to next Tuesday.

THE MIDDLESEX REGISTRY.

At the Clerkenwell County Court, on the 21st ult., the action brought by Messrs. Munton & Morris, to test the legality of the fees demanded for registering memorials, came on for hearing. The following report of the proceedings appears in the *Islington Gazette*.

Murray was counsel for plaintiff, and *Channel*, Q.C., for defendant.

In opening the case for the plaintiff, Mr. Murray said the action had been brought in order to test the legality of the charges imposed for registering deeds in the Middlesex Registry. The charges made in this office had frequently been matter of complaint, and returns had been moved for in the House of Commons, and a Royal Commission had sat to inquire into them. The plaintiff, in the present case, in order to have the matter decided as to what was a proper charge, prepared a case, and took a "memorial," of less than 200 words, to be filed in the usual way. This was filed, and it was endorsed by the registrar, and a certificate given in the usual way. Five shillings was charged, and now plaintiff sought to make the registrar say how he made up the charge. It was said to be made up in this way:—1s. 6d. for the memorial, 1s. 6d. for administering the oath, 1s. for what was called exhibiting the memorial, and 1s. for the certificate endorsed on the same. The learned counsel then referred to the 7th Anne, c. 20. In this, he contended, there was nothing to show a power on the part of the registrar to demand fees beyond the actual registration, except the certificate be given out of the office. It was obvious that "given out of the office" was by request, and one could quite understand going to a public office and requiring something done, and at the same time expecting to be charged. But if they went to a public office, and something was done whether they required it or not, it was a very different matter. The certificate on the back of the deed appeared to be a compulsory matter; but he contended that a party could take his memorial for registration, and say, "I don't want your certificate." He contended, also, that the words of the certificate at the back of the memorial were not to be counted with those of the memorial; and in order to test this, plaintiff had put 199 words out of a possible 200 (for which a shilling fee was charged) upon his memorial. Then he contended that a functionary in a public office had no right to charge for administering an oath, and further, that it was a part of the registration that the registrar should endorse the document, and, therefore, that he had no right to charge either for the oath or the certificate, and, further, that they had no right to include the words of the certificate in the number appearing on the memorial.

Channell, Q.C., argued with regard to the charge for taking the oath, that his client did the same work as a Master in Chancery, or other official administering the oath, and therefore was entitled to the same or proportionate pay. He practically admitted that there was nothing in the Act of Parliament to define the charges made, but said there was precedent for them, the usage of the office being the same for over a century, and there were books and documents in existence in proof of this. There was a certain amount of ambiguity about the Act of Parliament governing the office, and the registrar only charged what he considered reasonable compensation for services rendered.

Mr. F. K. Munton was called to prove the case for the plaintiff, as set forth in counsel's opening, and

The Deputy-Registrar was then examined for the defence. He said that Lord Truro was the Registrar for Deeds in the county of Middlesex, and he (witness) had been deputy about five years. Was in the office as accountant four years prior to his appointment as deputy. Lord Truro took his share of the fees of the office. It had always been the practice to charge more for registering than was mentioned in the 11th section of the Act of Queen Anne. The sums paid were entered on rough sheets and re-entered in the books, but no details were recorded as to what deeds the sums referred to. The rough sheets were destroyed after the books were periodically audited. The books

were always sent to the registrar, and returned to witness. The sheets were destroyed because they would be an unnecessary accumulation. All the memorials were in the office for a century and a-half back, and two of the old books between 1756 and 1776 had been found, and the entries corresponded with the memorials in the office. From these it appeared there had always been something like a uniform charge of 5s. for ordinary registration. Did not always count the words of the memorials, but guessed at them. If parties wished to have the words counted, then they had to wait whilst it was done. Sometimes those registering counted the words themselves before coming to the office, and their statements were accepted. He charged for the number of words, the oath, and the certificate upon the deeds. Did not charge for the oath if it was sworn out of the office.

In cross-examination, witness said there were special arrangements with some firms with regard to registrations; but to strangers the usual charge was 5s. No complaints had been made of the charges for registering during his time. Solicitors had sometimes remarked, "Don't you think this is too much?" and he had replied, "You have not marked the number of words on the memorial, and I don't care to count them." Did not charge for counting, and never said he expected payment for it—never hinted at it. If people wanted the words counted, they had just to take a chair and wait until it was done. Had had memorials brought and the solicitors had said, "We will pay only Parliamentary fees," and he had assented to it. Had charged more than 5s., and also correspondingly to the greater or lesser value of the property registered. For a small estate and a small memorial he had charged less than Parliamentary fees, and for a large estate he had charged more without reference to length.

The respective counsel replied; and the Judge, remarking that the only question was as to what the Registrar was entitled to charge, reserved his decision.

THE MANCHESTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883.

A committee recently appointed by the chamber to consider the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, with a view to suggested amendments, has made the following report:—

This committee is of opinion that the working of the Bankruptcy Act of 1883 has not in all respects proved satisfactory; but—whilst considering that, perhaps, sufficient time has not yet elapsed to allow of a fair judgment of its possible ultimate results, or to enable the committee to recommend any marked alteration of the law—is nevertheless of opinion that the matters alluded to in the following resolutions are worthy the considerations of the chamber:—

First Resolution.—That having regard to the great number of cases of insolvency which, since the present Bankruptcy Act came into operation, have been and are arranged privately, outside the provisions of that Act, this committee is of opinion that legislative steps ought to be taken to provide for the registration of such arrangements, so as to make them binding upon all creditors, if assented to by a large majority in number and value (say, seventy-eighths in number—excluding from the computation creditors under £10—and seven-eighths in value) of the creditors, it being in the opinion of this committee very desirable that the opposition of a small minority, actuated in most cases by the sole object of gaining a preference over the bulk of the creditors, should not be allowed to prevail against the *bonâ fide* wishes of the great majority of the creditors; but this committee is also of opinion that compulsory registration without the power to bind such minorities, or in cases where all the creditors are agreed, would not be expedient.

Second Resolution.—That the existing regulations as to proxies might with advantage be altered in the following particulars—viz., by providing—

(*a.*) That a creditor may give a general proxy to any creditor who proves, or a manager, clerk, or person in the regular employment of such creditor.

(*b.*) That a foreign or colonial creditor may also give such proxy to his correspondent in England.

(*c.*) That it shall no longer be necessary to obtain forms of proxy from the official receiver.

(*d.*) That the holder of a power of attorney from a creditor may either vote or appoint a proxy for the creditor.

This report was received and adopted by the board, and ordered to be printed in the appendix of the annual report for 1885.

At the annual meeting of the chamber on Monnday last, Mr. Gray said he was glad to find the directors had been moving in a direction which was likely to strengthen the hands of those who desired that private arrangements with creditors might be carried out without the consent of all the creditors. He thought it was important that in any case when seven-eighths of the creditors were in favour of a certain course that course should be adopted. He would be glad also if the board could see their way to recommending that all arrangements with creditors, whether made with the consent of seven-eighths of the latter or not, should be registered.

Mr. Lord said the directors could not recommend the compulsory registration of all cases of private arrangement, because it was felt that instances might arise where such a registration would not be desirable.

LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Sir Farrer Herschell, Q.C., M.P., who has been appointed Lord High Chancellor of England, is the eldest son of the Rev. Ridley Herschell, and was born in 1837. He was educated at University College, London, and he graduated B.A. at the University of London in 1857. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1860, and he formerly practised on the Northern Circuit. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1872, and he was recorder of the city of Carlisle from 1873 till 1880, when he was appointed Solicitor-General, and received the honour of knighthood, but he went out of office in June last. He was M.P. for the city of Durham in the Liberal interest from June, 1874, till November, 1885. The Lord Chancellor is a bencher of Lincoln's-inn.

Mr. Charles Arthur Russell, Q.C., M.P., who has been appointed Attorney-General, is the eldest son of Mr. Arthur Russell, of Newry, and was born in 1833. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Hilary Term, 1859, when he obtained a certificate of honour of the first class. He has practised on the Northern Circuit, and he became a Queen's Counsel in 1872. He was M.P. for Dundalk in the Liberal interest from April, 1880, till November, 1885, when he was elected M.P. for South Hackney. He is a bencher of Lincoln's-inn.

Mr. Charles Lamport, solicitor (of the firm of Lamport & Trimnell), of Southampton, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. William Brown, barrister, has been elected Treasurer of Gray's-inn for the ensuing year.

Mr. William Wollaston Karslake, Q.C., who has been appointed Controller of Legacy and Succession Duties, in succession to the late Mr. Alfred Howson, is the eldest son of the Rev. William Heberden Karslake and cousin of the late Sir John Karslake, and was born in 1834. He was educated at Harrow, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Easter Term, 1857. He practised for many years in the Court of Chancery, and he was counsel to the Legacy and Succession Duties Department from 1867 till 1881, when he became a Queen's Counsel. Mr. Karslake is a bencher of Lincoln's-inn.

Mr. Andrew Searle Hart, barrister, LL.D., has received the honour of Knighthood. Sir A. Hart is the eldest son of the Rev. George Vaughan Hart, and was born in 1811. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he graduated B.A. in 1832, and LL.D. in 1840, and he was called to the bar in Ireland in 1838. He was appointed vice-provost of Trinity College, Dublin, in 1876.

Mr. Finlay Knight, barrister, has been appointed a Registrar of the Court of Bankruptcy in succession to Mr. Philip Henry Pepys, resigned. Mr. Registrar Knight is the third son of Mr. John Knight, of Brighton, and was born in 1823. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1867, and he has practised in the Court of Bankruptcy.

Mr. Thomas Lamartine Yates, solicitor, of No. 28, Essex-street, Strand, London, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. William Brown has been elected Treasurer of Gray's-inn for the ensuing year.

Mr. Henry Stewart Cunningham, one of the Judges of the High Court at Calcutta, has been appointed to officiate as Chief Justice of Bengal, during the absence of Sir Richard Garth. Mr. Justice Cunningham is the eldest son of the Rev. John William Cunningham, vicar of Harrow, and was born in 1833. He was educated at Trinity College, Oxford, where he graduated second class in Classics in 1855. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1859, and he was formerly a member of the Home Circuit. He was Advocate-General for the Madras Presidency from 1873 till 1877, when he was appointed a judge of the High Court at Calcutta.

The Hon. Edward Chandos Leigh, Q.C., and Mr. Philip Albert Myburgh, Q.C., have been elected Benchers of the Inner Temple.

Mr. William Cunliffe Brooks, barrister, has been created a Baronet. Sir W. Brooks is the eldest son of Mr. Samuel Brooks, of Manchester, and was born in 1819. He was educated at Rugby and at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated as a senior optime in 1842. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1848, and he formerly practised on the Northern Circuit. He was M.P. for East Cheshire in the Conservative interest from October, 1869, till November, 1885. He is a deputy-lieutenant for Lancashire and a magistrate for Lancashire, Cheshire, and the city of Manchester.

Mr. Robert George Raper, solicitor and notary (of the firm of Raper & Freeland), of Chichester, has received the honour of Knighthood. Sir R. Raper is now serving the office of mayor of Chichester for the ninth time, and he is a magistrate and an alderman for the city. He was admitted a solicitor in 1850, and he is clerk to the Chichester Board of Guardians, superintendent-registrar, registrar of the Chichester District Probate Registry, clerk to the county magistrates and Commissioners of Taxes, secretary to the Bishop of Chichester, deputy-registrar of the diocese and archdeaconry of Chichester, and chapter clerk of Chichester Cathedral. Sir R. Raper is also lecturer in ecclesiastical law at the Chichester Theological College.

LEGAL NEWS.

At the Exeter Assizes Mr. Justice Stephen said that he had known instances in which the police had read over to witnesses the depositions they had made, and he wished it to be known that it was an exceedingly improper and mistaken practice.

It is rumoured that the following Irish legal appointments will be made under the new Administration:—Lord Chancellor, the Right Hon. J. Naish; Attorney-General, The MacDermott, Q.C.; and Solicitor-General, Mr. Serjeant Hemphill. The Right Hon. Samuel Walker, Q.C., who filled the office of Attorney-General under Mr. Gladstone's last Administration, will, it is stated, succeed Mr. Justice Lawson, who is on the eve of retiring from the Queen's Bench.

Mr. Commissioner Kerr, in dealing with a case in the City of London Court on Tuesday, in which a firm of law stationers sought to recover money from a solicitor for settling certain bills of costs, said that it was not creditable to the legal profession to have such persons as taxing-masters. The *raison d'être* of the system was that members of the profession had so conducted themselves that taxing masters had become a necessity of the times. If he were to legislate, which he could not, he would not allow such a system at all. He would make every professional man draw his own bill of costs and make his own charges.

Judge Woodforde, at the Derby County Court on Tuesday, referring to administration orders, said that it appeared to him they were entire failures. Men obtained them to avoid having to pay their debts, and, when they did pay, often borrowed money and incurred fresh debts. The Treasury were the only persons who appeared to gain anything from these orders, as they received two shillings in the pound before any creditors were paid. He felt strongly indeed that Parliament should have the matter inquired into, as this part of the Bankruptcy Act could never have been properly understood, or it would not have been passed.

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	Appeal Court No. 1.	Appeal Court No. 2.	V. C. Bacon.	Mr. Justice Kay.
Mon., Feb. 8	Mr. Koe	Mr. Leach	Mr. Pemberton	Mr. Pugh
Tuesday ... 9	Clowes	Beal	Ward	Lavie
Wed..... 10	Jackson	Leach	Pemberton	Pugh
Thur..... 11	Carrington	Beal	Ward	Lavie
Friday 12	Lavie	Leach	Pemberton	Pugh
Saturday .. 13	Pugh	Beal	Ward	Lavie

	Mr. Justice Chitty.	Mr. Justice North.	Mr. Justice Pearson.
Monday, Feb..... 8	Mr. King	Mr. Clowes	Mr. Carrington
Tuesday 9	Farrer	Koe	Jackson
Wednesday..... 10	King	Clowes	Carrington
Thursday..... 11	Farrer	Koe	Jackson
Friday 12	King	Clowes	Carrington
Saturday 13	Farrer	Koe	Jackson

COMPANIES.

WINDING-UP NOTICES.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

CHESTERFIELD AND DISTRICT TRAMWAYS COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 27, directed to be heard before Pearson, J., on Feb 6. Maddisons, King's Arms yard, solicitors for the petitioner

HAMPTON COURT STEAM LAUNDRY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Chitty, J., has, by an order dated Dec 21, appointed Howard Childs Parkes, 8, Old Jewry, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Feb 6, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Tuesday, Feb 23 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

HEMSWORTH COLLIERY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 28, directed to be heard before Chitty, J., on Saturday, Feb 13. Pritchard and Co, Painters' Hall, Little Trinity lane, agents for Leigh, Manchester, solicitor for the petitioners

LANCASHIRE STEAM COMPANY, LIMITED.—Pearson, J., has, by an order dated Jan 19, appointed Edwin Mansfield, 28, Barton arcade, Manchester, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before March 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Monday, March 22 at 1, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

[*Gazette*, Jan. 29.]

METROPOLITAN GUARANTEE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by Chitty, J., dated Jan 16, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Indermaur and Brown, Chancery lane, agents for Walker, Bolton le Moors, solicitor for the petitioners

OTTO COMPANY, LIMITED.—Bacon, V.C., has, by an order dated Jan 18, appointed Herbert Ernest Matthieu Davies, 2, Gresham bldgs, Basinghall st, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before March 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Monday, March 15 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

QUEENBOROUGH CEMENT COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by Kay, J., dated Jan 23, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Warner, Quality ct, solicitor for the petitioner

[*Gazette*, Feb. 2.]

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BRISTOL PORT AND CHANNEL DOCK COMPANY.—Creditors are required, on or before March 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles Fitch Kemp, 8, Walbrook. Tuesday, March 16 at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

[*Gazette*, Feb. 2.]

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

LITHGOW BOOT AND SHOE MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 27, directed to be heard before Fox-Bristowe, V.C., at the Assize Courts, Manchester, on Monday, Feb 8, at 10.30. Addleshaw and Warburton, Manchester, solicitors for the petitioner

LIVERPOOL ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 27, directed to be heard before the Vice-Chancellor, at the Assize Courts, Manchester, on Monday, Feb 8. Gorst, Liverpool, agent for Grundy and Co, solicitors

[*Gazette*, Jan. 29.]

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

NO. 1 RAILWAY HOTEL BENEFIT BUILDING SOCIETY, ACCRINGTON.—By an order made by Fox-Bristowe, V.C., dated Jan 13, it was ordered that the society be wound up. Slater and Co, Manchester, agents for Hall and Co, Accrington, solicitors for the petitioner

[*Gazette*, Jan. 29.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

JUVENILES OF THE LOYAL ORDER OF ALFREDS FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Board School Room, Varteg, Monmouth. Jan 25

LOVE AND UNITY SOCIETY, Cottage Spring Tavern, Dudley Port, Stafford. Jan 26

[*Gazette*, Jan. 29.]

HIGH-LANE WOMEN'S SICK CLUB, Bull's Head Inn, High-lane, Chester. Jan 29

LITTLETON'S LOYAL LODGE, 1, Reformed Order of Odd Fellows, called Ancient Britons, Royal Oak Inn, Cannock, Stafford. Jan 29

[*Gazette*, Feb. 2.]

SUSPENDED FOR THREE MONTHS.

CROSSLEY HALL LODGE, National Independent Order of Odd Fellows' Friendly Society, Old King's Head Inn, Allerton, Bradford, York. Jan 28

[*Gazette*, Feb. 2.]

CREDITORS' CLAIMS.

CREDITORS UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

BOWES, JOHN, Streatlam Castle, Durham, Esq. Feb 27. Strathmore v Vane, Pearson, J. Weston, Essex st, Strand

BOTTOMLEY, WILLIAM, Hipperholme, Halifax, York, Gent. Feb 22. Bradford Banking Company, Limited, v Bottomley, V.C.B. Killick, Bradford

CROSS, JOHN, Liverpool, Slate Merchant. Mar 1. Prickett v Cross, Pearson, J. Hall, Lancaster

JOHNSON, WILLIAM, Hoxton st, Tripe Dresser. Feb 26. Cole v Johnson, Chitty, J. Crosse and Sons, Lancaster pl, Strand

LANDROCK, CARL GUSTAV, Hand ct, Holborn, Licensed Victualler. Feb 25. White v Landrock, Pearson, J. Spiers, King st, Cheapside

RAYNER, JOHN RICHARD, Pretoria, South Africa. Feb 20. Rayner v Daw, Bacon, V.C. Nisbet and Daw, Lincoln's inn fields

[*Gazette*, Jan. 26.]

HOBBS, SAMUEL, New Cross rd, Deptford, Mason. Feb 28. Hobbs v Wade, Pearson, J. Mote, Gray's inn sq

THORN, WILLIAM SOLOMON, Croydon, Oil Merchant. Feb 25. Dossett v Laundy, Bacon, V.C. Laundy, Cecil st, Strand

[*Gazette*, Jan. 29.]

DAVIS, MORRIS, Cheetham Hill, Manchester, India Rubber Manufacturer. Feb 26. Horrocks v Mills, Registrar, Manchester District. Hislop, Manchester

REFFELL, RICHARD, Little Ilford, Essex, Railway Clerk. Feb 27. Carpenter v Langton, Kay, J. Johnson, Queen st, Cheapside

[*Gazette*, Feb. 2.]

CREDITORS UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

BARRACLOUGH, SAMUEL, Bowdon, Chester, Gent. Feb 25. Hulme and Co, Manchester

BEETHAM, JOHN ABRAHAM, West Harsley, nr Northallerton, York, Farmer. Feb 22. Wilford, Sunderland

BELL, ISABELLA, Crawcrook, nr Ryton, Durham. Robinson, Sunderland

BLAIKLOCK, JANE, Blackburn. Mar 28. Wilding and Son

BOWES, RICHARD, Millom, Cumberland, Yeoman. Mar 1. Butler, Broughton in Furness

EDWARDS, ANN, Hendre, Llanallin, Denbigh. Mar 16. Minshalls and Parry-Jones, Oswestry

EMETT, CHARLES, Overndale Downend, Mangotsfield, Gloucestershire, Yeoman. Feb 28. Dix, Bristol

FAIRHURST, JAMES, Liverpool, Gent. Feb 10. Lynch and Teebay, Liverpool

FARROW, FRANCES, Scotforth, nr Lancaster. Feb 22. Swainson and Co, Lancaster

FRACKLETON, MARY ANN, Ventia rd, Finsbury pk. Feb 26. Smith and Son, Furnival's inn, Holborn

GALLWEY, MIGUEL DAVID, Lisbon, Portugal, Landowner. Mar 6. Crump and Son, Philpot lane

GREEN, THOMAS WILLIAM, Trinity sq, Tower hill, Merchant. Mar 8. Mackenzie and Rhodes, Chancery lane

HARGRAVE, HENRY, Bootle, nr Liverpool, Master Mariner. Feb 22. Gardner and Smith, Liverpool

HART, FRANCES, Kensington gdns sq, Bayswater. Feb 22. H. Bervis

HOLME, JANE, Seatoller, Borrowdale, Cumberland. Mar 1. Butler, Broughton in Furness

LOCKYER, JAMES LAWES, Plymouth. Apr 15. Rooker and Co, Plymouth

MOCATTA, ISAAC, Kensington pk rd, Gent. Mar 1. Lindo and Co, Coleman st

MORTIMER, WILLIAM, Plymouth. Mar 1. Henry Bartlett, Arthur st West

OLIVER, MARY, Newtown, Montgomery. Mar 1. Bennett Rowlands, Newtown

OLIVER, SAMUEL, Charlotte st, Fitzroy sq, Gent. Mar 1. Miller, Clifford's inn

RYAN, TIMOTHY, Liverpool. Feb 21. Wright and Co, Liverpool

SALT, JAMES JONES, Birmingham, Lamp Manufacturer. Mar 1. Rowley and Chatwin, Birmingham

SMITH, CECIL, Devynock, Brecon. Feb 25. Tennant and Jones, Abersavon

SLATER, EDWARD, Barnoldswick, York, Gent. Mar 31. Hartley, Colne

STACKPOOLE, ROBERT WARD, Pinner's Hall, Old Broad st, Solicitor. Mar 1. Stackpoole and Co, Old Broad st

SWALLOW, DAVID, Liverpool, Pipe Manufacturer. Feb 9. Danger and Neville, Liverpool

TYSER, AUGUSTUS WILLIAM, Corn Merchant. East, Basinghall st

WAKE, ELIZABETH, Trafalgar rd, Old Kent rd. Feb 21. Jones, Spital sq
WALKER, ELIZABETH, Talebert, Shap, Westmoreland. Mar 6. Little and Lamonby, Penrith
WARD, ELIZABETH, Sheffield, Agricultural Merchant. Mar 31. Clegg and Sons, Sheffield
WARTH, JOHN, Chatteris, Isle of Ely, Farmer. Mar 1. Seward, Chatteris
WOLEDGE, HENRY, Addiscombe, Surrey, Gent. Feb 24. Tattam, Bishopsgate st
YARDLEY, Dame AMELIA. Tunbridge, Kent. Feb 25. Saffery and Son, Tooley st
[*Gazette*, Jan. 26.]

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

Feb. 9.—Mr. ALFRED RICHARDS, at the Mart, at 1 for 2 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, Jan. 30, p. 230).
Feb. 12.—Messrs. BAKER & SONS, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Building Estate (see advertisement, this week, p. 4).

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTH.

KEBBELL.—Jan. 29, at Woodford Wells, Essex, the wife of George Kebbell, solicitor, of a daughter.

DEATH.

FORMAN.—Jan. 28, at No. 6, Drummond-place, Edinburgh, James Forman, advocate, aged 73.

LONDON GAZETTES.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.
Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

TUESDAY, Jan. 26, 1886.

Cooper, Henry Law, Westham, Sussex, Clerk in Holy Orders. Nov 19

FRIDAY, Jan. 29, 1886.

Barnett, Montague, and Eleazer Barnett, King st, Cheapside, Trimmings Manufacturers. Jan 26

THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883.

FRIDAY, Jan. 29, 1886.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

Allen, William, Leicester, Engineer. Leicester. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 10 at 10
Barber, Edward John, Luton, Builder. Luton. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 25 at 2 at Court house, Luton
Barford, Josiah, Luton, Straw Hat Manufacturer. Luton. Pet Jan 23. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 25 at 2 at Court house, Luton
Beardmore, James, jun., Longton, Staffordshire, Ironmonger's Assistant. Stoke upon Trent and Longton. Pet Jan 23. Ord Jan 23. Exam Feb 9 at 11.15
Billing, Herbert Hutley, Dollis rd, Church End, Finchley, Builder. Barnet. Pet Jan 23. Ord Jan 23. Exam Feb 17 at 11 at Townhall, Barnet
Boyles, George, and John Blackwell, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, Builders. Aylesbury. Pet Jan 19. Ord Jan 25. Exam Mar 10 at 11.30 at County Hall, Aylesbury
Broadbent, George, Bradford, Grocer. Bradford. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 16
Brooker, James, Cwmbran, Mon, Innkeeper. Newport, Mon. Pet Jan 26. Ord Jan 26. Exam Feb 9 at 11
Brown, George, Stockton on Tees, Grocer. Stockton on Tees and Middlesborough. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 3
Burroughes, Thomas, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Grocer. Great Yarmouth. Pet Jan 26. Ord Jan 26. Exam Mar 1 at 2.30 at Townhall, Great Yarmouth
Butterworth, Simeon, Shaw, Lancashire, Minder. Oldham. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 26. Exam Feb 23 at 11.30
Campbell, George, Cromford rd, West hill, Wandsworth, Builder. High Court. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Mar 3 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Case, Frederick, Cardiff, Fruit Merchant. Cardiff. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 23 at 2
Darda, Joseph, Kennington pk rd, Lighterman. High Court. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 26. Exam Mar 3 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Davis, Isaac Joseph, Alvington crescent, Dalston, Auctioneer. High Court. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25. Exam Mar 3 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Dolman, Abel Upton, Birmingham, Commission Agent. Birmingham. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 25 at 2
Evans, Benjamin Arthur, East Retford, Nottinghamshire, Grocer. Lincoln. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Mar 3 at 2.30
Everett, Charles Henry, Iverson rd, Kilburn, Builder. High Court. Pet Dec 22. Ord Jan 27. Exam Mar 4 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Ford, Samuel, Blakeney, Gloucestershire, Innkeeper. Gloucester. Pet Jan 16. Ord Jan 27. Exam Mar 2
Gibson, Alexander, Southwick, Durham, Grocer. Sunderland. Pet Jan 23. Ord Jan 23. Exam Feb 4
Gibson, Frederick William, Leeds, Tea Dealer. Leeds. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 2 at 11
Gyll, F. G., Canterbury, Lieut-Col. Canterbury. Pet Nov 24. Ord Jan 26. Exam Feb 12
Hansom, Henry John, Park rd, Haverstock hill, Architect. High Court. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Mar 5 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Hodgson, Thomas, Newcastle upon Tyne, Tea Dealer. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 9
Jefferson, Robert, Marton, nr Ouseburn, Yorks, Innkeeper. York. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 26 at 11 at Guildhall, York
Jenkins, David, Tenby, Tailor. Pembroke Dock. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 26. Exam Feb 3 at 2.30
Jenkinson, Thomas, Gt. Grimsby, Lincolnshire, Tailor. Gt. Grimsby. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 10 at 11 at Townhall, Grimsby
Jordan, John Israel, Lazonby, Cumberland, Innkeeker. Carlisle. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 9 at 11 at Court house, Carlisle
Lawrence, Alfred Charles, Bromley, Clothier. Croydon. Pet Jan 18. Ord Jan 18. Exam Feb 19
Marsh, George, Portsea, Licensed Victualler. Portsmouth. Pet Jan 26. Ord Jan 26. Exam Feb 15
Mason, Alfred Edmund, Derby, Oil Merchant. Derby. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 20 at 10
Pearson, Thomas, and William Henry Hiley, York, Grocers. York. Pet Jan 26. Ord Jan 26. Exam Feb 12 at 11 at Guildhall, York
Reynolds, Vincent, John Allen, and Francis Tring Pearce, Gloucester, Millers and Bakers. Gloucester. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 9
Rohrbach, Friedrich Ludwig, Old Compton st, Soho, Butcher. High Court. Pet Jan 26. Ord Jan 26. Exam Mar 2 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Shead, Walter, Braintree, Essex, Baker. Chelmsford. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 8 at 12 at Shirehall, Chelmsford
Smith, John, Brighton, Beer Retailer. Brighton. Pet Jan 26. Ord Jan 26. Exam Feb 11 at 11
Thomas, Inkerman Albert, Devonport, Hairdresser. East Stonehouse. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 22 at 11
Underhill, Henry William, Upper Thames st, Manufacturer of Stoves. High Court. Pet Jan 26. Ord Jan 26. Exam Mar 9 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Walker, John Henry, Hatfield Peverel, Essex, Brick Merchant. Chelmsford. Pet Jan 14. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 8 at 1 at Shirehall, Chelmsford
Ward, Daniel, Heworth, Farmer. York. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 12 at 11 at Guildhall, York
Waters, George, East Grinsted, Sussex, Licensed Victualler. Brighton. Pet Jan 23. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 11 at 11
Wiggins, Mary Roberts, Princess st, Barnsley, Dressmaker. Barnsley. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25. Exam Feb 18 at 11.30
Williams, Levi Edward, Lampeter Velfrey, Weaver. Pembroke Dock. Pet Jan 26. Ord Jan 26. Exam Feb 3 at 2

FIRST MEETINGS.

Allen, William, Leicester, Engineer. Feb 8 at 3. Official Receiver, 28, Friar lane, Leicester
Atkins, Henry, Wormwood st, Importer of Tobacconists' Fancy Goods. Feb 10 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
Attrill, Arthur, Rookley, nr Newport, Isle of Wight, Baker. Feb 6 at 11. Official Receiver, Newport, Isle of Wight
Barford, Josiah, Luton, Straw Hat Manufacturer. Feb 6 at 12. Official Receiver, 29, Park st West, Luton
Barne, William Charles, Cannon st, Retired Officer in H.M. Army. Feb 8 at 2. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
Bartels, Ernest Albert, Harringay pk, Crouch End, Stockbroker. Feb 5 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
Borton, Henry, Leamington, Leather Seller. Feb 8 at 11. Edward Thomas Peirson, Official Receiver, 17, Hertford st, Coventry
Bradshaw, John, Fleetwood, Lancashire, Ship Owner. Feb 5 at 2. Whitworth's Institute, Fleetwood
Broadbent, George, Bradford, Grocer. Feb 8 at 11. Official Receiver, 31, Manor row, Bradford
Brooker, James, Cwmbran, Monmouthshire, Innkeeper. Feb 9 at 12. Official Receiver, 12, Tredegar pl, Newport, Mon
Brown, George, Stockton on Tees, Grocer. Feb 9 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough
Brown, James Bryce, Cannon st, Iron Merchant. Feb 9 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
Butterworth, Simeon, Shaw, Lancashire, Minder. Feb 9 at 3. Official Receiver, Priory chbrs, Union st, Oldham
Catt, Stephen, Polegate, Sussex, Wheelwright. Feb 5 at 12. Official Receiver, 39, Bond st, Brighton
Fidgen, James, High rd, Kilburn, Carter. Feb 5 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
Finch, Henry, St Helen's, Lancashire, Licensed Victualler. Feb 8 at 2. Official Receiver, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
Gent, William Edward, Darlington, Durham, Joiner. Feb 9 at 11. Official Receiver, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough
Gibson, Alexander, Southwick, Durham, Grocer. Feb 5 at 2.30. Official Receiver, 21, Fawcett st, Sunderland
Greenwell, Leonard, Queen's rd, Bayswater, no occupation. Feb 8 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
Gyll, F. G., Canterbury, Lieut-Colonel. Feb 3 at 11.30. Bankruptcy buildings, Portugal st
Hambridge, Herbert, Yeovil, Glove Manufacturer. Feb 5 at 1. Official Receiver, Salisbury
Hiley, William Henry (sep estate), York, Grocer. Feb 8 at 2. Official Receiver, York
Hodgson, Thomas, Newcastle on Tyne, Tea Dealer. Feb 10 at 11. Official Receiver, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
Howard, Abel, Birmingham, Boot Maker. Feb 8 at 11. Official Receiver, Birmingham
Howard, Ernest, Knapp rd, Devons rd, Bow, Surveyor. Feb 8 at 2. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
Ingham, Jonathan, Bradford, Contractor. Feb 5 at 11.45. Official Receiver, 31, Manor row, Bradford
Ingle, John William, Cridling Stubbs, nr Knottingly, Yorks, Farmer. Feb 5 at 11. Red Lion Hotel, Pontefract
Jefferson, Robert, Marton, nr Ouseburn, Yorks, Innkeeper. Feb 10 at 12. Official Receiver, York
Jenkins, William Edwin, Leominster, Herefordshire, out of business. Feb 5 at 4 Railway Hotel, Weston super Mare
Jordan, John Israel, Lazonby, Cumberland, Innkeeper. Feb 9 at 12. Official Receiver, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle
Kynaston, Robert Charles, Margaret st, Clerkenwell, Licensed Victualler. Feb 5 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
Lawrence, Alfred Charles, Bromley, Clothier. Feb 5 at 12. Official Receiver, 109, Victoria st, Westminster
McKenzie, Frank, Queen's rd, Bayswater, Gentleman. Feb 8 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
Megson, Benjamin Oldroyd, Dewsbury, Yorks, Salesman. Feb 5 at 3. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Batley
Milward, John, and Thomas Ganner, Stourbridge, Worcestershire, Spade Manufacturers. Feb 8 at 10.30. Talbot Hotel, Stourbridge
Moulton, Edward, Cranham, Gloucestershire, Potter. Feb 6 at 11. Official Receiver, 15, King st, Gloucester
Pearson, Thomas (sep estate), York, Grocer. Feb 8 at 1. Official Receiver, York
Pearson, Thomas, and William Henry Hiley, York, Grocers. Feb 8 at 12. Official Receiver, York
Reynolds, Vincent, John Allen, and Francis Tring Pearce, Gloucester, Millers. Feb 6 at 3. Bell Hotel, Gloucester
Shead, Walter, Braintree, Essex, Baker. Feb 9 at 11. Horn Hotel, Braintree
Squire, William, Barnsley, Tailor. Feb 8 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 3, Eastgate, Barnsley
Synnot, Charles Forbes Goodhart, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, Schoolmaster. Feb 6 at 12. Gate House Hotel, Tenby
Tarte, Mary, Richard's Castle, Herefordshire, Farmer. Feb 8 at 10.30. J. J. Sudbury, Mill st, Ludlow
Taylor, Thomas Gideon, Crayford, Kent, Grocer. Feb 5 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Eastgate, Rochester
Thomas, Inkerman Albert, Devonport, Hairdresser. Feb 8 at 11. Official Receiver, 18, Frankfort st, Plymouth
Treble, John, and Samuel Treble, Merton rd, Wandsworth, Builders. Feb 8 at 3. Official Receiver, 109, Victoria st, Westminster

Ward, Daniel, Heworth, Farmer. Feb 6 at 12. Official Receiver, York
Wilson, Barkly Charles, Hopton road, Coventry park, Streatham, Frilling Manufacturer. Feb 8 at 12. Bankruptcy buildings, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields

ADJUDICATIONS.

Backhouse, Elizabeth, Marton, nr Easingwold, Farmer. York. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 22
Beard, Michael Hill, Leicester, Tailor. Leicester. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 25
Beardmore, James, sen, Newcastle under Lyme, Ironmonger. Hanley, Burslem, and Tunstall. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 25
Brightman, Thomas, Little Staughton, Bedfordshire, Farmer. Bedford. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 26
Broadbent, George, Bradford, Grocer. Bradford. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25
Brooker, James, Cwmbran, Mon., Innkeeper. Newport, Mon. Pet Jan 26. Ord Jan 27
Browning, William Frederick, Mile End rd, Fruiterer. High Court. Pet Jan 21. Ord Jan 27
Butterworth, Simeon, Shaw, Lancashire, Minder. Oldham. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 26
Cole, Alexander, Anerley, Surrey. Croydon. Pet Nov 4. Ord Jan 8
Dolling, Edwin, Crosby row, Long lan , Bermondsey, Carman. High Court. Pet Dec 4. Ord Jan 26
Duguid, Robert Miller Alexander, Liverpool, Commission Merchant. Liverpool. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 26
Ford, Samuel, Blakeney, Gloucestershire, Innkeeper. Gloucester. Pet Jan 16. Ord Jan 27
Garfoot, Charles, Ryhall, Rutlandshire, Publican. Peterborough. Pet Jan 15. Ord Jan 26
Garthwaite, Charles Wheatley, Huddersfield, out of business. Huddersfield, Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 26
Hobbs, W. H., Devonshire st, Portland pl. High Court. Pet July 7. Ord Jan 27
Ingham, Jonathan, Bradford, Contractor. Bradford. Pet Jan 23. Ord Jan 25
Jenkinson, Thomas, Great Grimsby, Tailor. Great Grimsby. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 25
Jordan, John Israel, Lazonby, Cumberland, Innkeeper. Carlisle. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27
Killick, Thomas, Chester, Tobacconist. Chester. Pet Dec 19. Ord Jan 23
Lowndes, Octavius Selby, Little Lindford, Buckinghamshire, Clerk in Holy Orders. Northampton. Pet Sept 26. Ord Jan 23
Marsh, George, St George's sq, Portsea, Licensed Victualler. Portsmouth. Pet Jan 26. Ord Jan 26
Mathers, Samuel, Leeds, Cloth Manufacturer. Leeds. Pet Jan 14. Ord Jan 25
Miller, Charles Squire, East st, Walworth, Baker. High Court. Pet Jan 21. Ord Jan 25
Millward, John, and Thomas Ganner, Stourbridge, Worcestershire, Spade Manufacturers. Stourbridge. Pet Jan 2. Ord Jan 25
Mitchell, John William Parker, Dewsbury, Yorks, Butcher. Dewsbury. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 25
Morgan, Edward, Llanidloes, Montgomeryshire, Innkeeper. Newtown. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 26
Morris, John, Penrhyndeudraeth, Merionethshire, Retired Licensed Victualler. Bangor. Pet Dec 24. Ord Jan 27
Pate, John Leaden, Cambridge, Builder. Cambridge. Pet Jan 21. Ord Jan 25
Richmond, Frederick James, Oldham, Lancashire, Veterinary Surgeon. Oldham. Pet Jan 12. Ord Jan 26
Riley, George, Hucknall Torkard, Notts, Cellarman. Nottingham. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 26
Roper, Alfred C, Mincing lane, Colonial Broker. High Court. Pet Oct 31. Ord Jan 26
Spencer, James, Murrah Hall, nr Penrith, Cumberland, Farmer. Carlisle. Pet Jan 12. Ord Jan 27
Sperring, Henry George, Chislehurst, Builder. Croydon. Pet Dec 9. Ord Jan 13
Stringfellow, William, Kirkby in Ashfield, Notts, Beerhouse Keeper. Nottingham. Pet Dec 23. Ord Jan 25
Treble, John, and Samuel Treble, Merton rd, Wandsworth, Builders. Wandsworth. Pet Dec 19. Ord Jan 26
Waddle, Thomas, Gateshead, Durham, Plumber. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Dec 19. Ord Jan 27
Wells, William, Birmingham, Rag Merchant. Birmingham. Pet Jan 23. Ord Jan 27
Williams, William, Portmadoc, Carnarvonshire, Tailor. Bangor. Pet Jan 18. Ord Jan 25
Willis, Frederick, King st, St James, Wine Merchant. High Court. Pet Sept 24. Ord Jan 26
Witcomb, Charles Richard, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Bristol. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 26

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Jan 22.

Dixon, John English, and Herbert Keyworth, Nottingham, Leatherdressers. Nottingham. Pet Dec 18. Ord Jan 20

TUESDAY, Feb. 2, 1886.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

Baker, Thomas, Newington, Kent, Bootmaker. Rochester. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 25 at 2
Bandy, William, Westbromwich, Staffordshire, out of business. Oldbury. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 22
Barnard, Emma, Southtown, Suffolk, Boat Owner. Gt Yarmouth. Pet Jan 29. Ord Jan 29. Exam Mar 1 at 2.30 at Townhall, Gt Yarmouth
Bates, Thomas, Bilsington, Kent, Farmer. Canterbury. Pet Jan 29. Ord Jan 30. Exam Feb 19
Biggs, John, Crondall st, Hoxton, Tin Plate Worker. High Court. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30. Exam March 10 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Briggs, James, Distillery row, Burton Bridge, nr Barnsley, Labourer. Barnsley. Pet Jan 21. Ord Jan 30. Exam Feb 18 at 11.30
Bruce, Robert, Bungay, Suffolk, Licensed Victualler. Gt Yarmouth. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30. Exam Mar 1 at 2.30 at Townhall, Gt Yarmouth
Bunt, Edward John, Manchester, Confectioner. Manchester. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 30. Exam Feb 16 at 1
Bush, William, North st, Limehouse fields, Fish Curer. High Court. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30. Exam March 10 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Chattock, Thomas, Brockenhurst, Hampshire, Gent. Southampton. Pet Jan 15. Ord Jan 29. Exam Feb 12 at 12
Culver, Frederick, Ramsgate, Kent, Whitesmith. Canterbury. Pet Jan 29. Ord Jan 29. Exam Feb 19
Curteis, Samuel, The Terrace, Sudbury, Gent. St Albans. Pet Jan 14. Ord Jan 29. Exam Feb 26
Driver, Jane, Windsor, Widow. Windsor. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 27 at 12
Elliot, Frederick Herbert, Barbican, Importer of Fancy Goods. High Court. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Mar 19 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Fletcher, Alfred, Croydon, Dairyman. Croydon. Pet Jan 29. Ord Jan 29. Exam Feb 19
Herman, Thomas, Great Yarmouth, Beerhouse Keeper. Great Yarmouth. Pet Jan 29. Ord Jan 29. Exam Mar 1 at 2.30 at Townhall, Great Yarmouth
Homes, Frederick, Great Yarmouth, Moulder. Great Yarmouth. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Mar 1 at 2.30
Howe, John, Leamington, Warwickshire, Tallow Chandler. Coventry. Pet Jan 26. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 22
Huggins, George, Sedgeford, Norfolk, Grocer. King's Lynn. Pet Jan 29. Ord Jan 29. Feb 18 at 10.30 at Court House, King's Lynn
Illingworth, Luke, Sheffield, Stone Mason. Sheffield. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 18 at 11.30
Inch, John, Crediton, Devon, Builder. Exeter. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30. Exam Mar 18 at 11
Jackson, George, Seaton Ross, Yorks, Boot Maker. York. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30. Exam Feb 26 at 11 at Guildhall, York
Jacobs, William, Treorky, Glamorganshire, Furniture Dealer. Pontypridd. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 16 at 2
Jones, Kyffin, Ruthin, Denbighshire, Hotel Keeper. Wrexham. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 9
Kimpton, George. Cardross st, Hammersmith, Builder. High Court. Pet Dec 21. Ord Jan 29. Exam Mar 4 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Lake, James, Chatsworth rd, Clapton pk, Grocer. High Court. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Mar 4 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Mason, James, Sarsfield, Cardiff, Pork Butcher. Cardiff. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 23 at 2
Mead, Samuel Robert, Somerset, Hatter. Frome. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 12
Morritt, Charles, Briggate, Leeds, Licensed Victualler. Leeds. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30. Exam Feb 16 at 11
Mucklow, John, Leadenham, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Boston. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Mar 4 at 2
Mudon, John, Gloucester rd, Queen's gate, South Kensington, Goldsmith. High Court. Pet Jan 15. Ord Jan 29. Exam Mar 4 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Neath, Joseph, Kibworth Beauchamp, Leicestershire, Licensed Victualler. Leicester. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 10 at 10
Nicholl, Ann, Halifax, Finisher. Halifax. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30. Exam Feb 15
Nunn, Herbert Elias, Wyndham rd, Camberwell, Manufacturing Confectioner. High Court. Pet Jan 29. Ord Jan 29. Exam Mar 4 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Pearse, John, Minehead, Somerset, Builder. Taunton. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30. Exam Feb 17 at 2.30
Phillips, John, Liverpool st, Walworth, Engineer. High Court. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30. Exam Mar 11 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Pilbrow, E. F., Margate, Hotel Proprietor. Canterbury. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 29. Exam Feb 19
Platt, George, Snow hill, Importer of Lamps. High Court. Pet Jan 29. Ord Jan 29. Exam Mar 4 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Queenborough, John, Boston, Lincolnshire, Chemist. Boston. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Mar 4 at 2
Reece, Henry, Shirenewton, Mon., Haulier. Newport, Mon. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 11 at 11
Reeland, Frederick, Three Colt street, Limehouse, Licensed Victualler. High Court. Pet Jan 21. Ord Jan 29. Exam Mar 11 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Rees, William Harries, High st, Haverfordwest, Chemist. Pembroke Dock. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 10 at 11.30
Roberts, Frank, Falmouth, Cornwall, Ironmonger. Truro. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 18 at 11
Rowland, James, Boston, Lincolnshire, Fisherman. Boston. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30. Exam Mar 4 at 2
Ryding, Henry, Penwortham, nr Preston, Beerseller. Preston. Pet Jan 29. Ord Jan 29. Exam Feb 26
Skermer, John, Westbromwich, Staffordshire, Grocer. Oldbury. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 22
Stock, Sydney Campbell, Speenham rd, Stockwell, Builder. High Court. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Mar 9 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Styles, Joseph, Canterbury, Licensed Victualler. Canterbury. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 12
Turner, Henry, Mickfield, Suffolk, Farmer. Ipswich. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 19 at 11
Taverner, William George, Lebanon gdns, Wandsworth, Vocalist. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28. Exam Feb 25
Watmough, Richard, Clee, Lincolnshire, Steam Tug Owner. Gt Grimsby. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 27. Exam Feb 10 at 11 at Townhall, Grimsby
Whaley, William, Scarborough, Lodging House Keeper. Scarborough. Pet Jan 29. Ord Jan 29. Exam Mar 2 at 12
Wheeler, William H., Bassien Park rd, Shepherd's Bush, Builder. High Court. Pet Dec 21. Ord Jan 28. Exam Mar 9 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Wilkins, C. M., Strand, M.D. High Court. Pet Jan 11. Ord Jan 28. Exam Mar 9 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields
Williams, Thomas, Llanstephan, Carmarthenshire, Miller. Carmarthen. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30. Exam Feb 9

FIRST MEETINGS.

Baker, Thomas, Newington, Kent, Bootmaker. Feb 11 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Eastgate, Rochester
Barber, Edward John, Luton, Bedfordshire, Builder. Feb 10 at 12. Official Receiver, 29, Park st West, Luton, Beds
Beardmore, James, jun, Longton, Staffordshire, Ironmonger's Assistant. Feb 9 at 3. Official Receiver, Newcastle under Lyme
Belt, Richard, William st, Lowndes sq, Sculptor. Feb 11 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
Biven, William James, Bristol, Commercial Traveller. Feb 19 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Bristol
Browning, William Frederick, Mile End rd, Mile End, Fruiterer. Feb 11 at 2. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
Burkinshaw, Joseph John, Lincoln, Farmer. Mar 3 at 12. Official Receiver, 2, St Benedict's sq, Lincoln
Chattock, Thomas, Brockenhurst, Hampshire, Gent. Feb 12 at 11. Official Receiver, 4, East st, Southampton
Cherry, William, North rd, Cattle Market, Islington, Cab Driver. Feb 10 at 2. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
Davis, Isaac Joseph, Alvington crescent, Dalston, Auctioneer. Feb 11 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
Evans, Benjamin Arthur, Westfield, East Retford, Nottinghamshire, Grocer. Mar 3 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 2, St Benedict's sq, Lincoln
Finding, Samuel, Rounds, Northamptonshire, Draper. Feb 13 at 3. County Court, Northampton
Ford, Samuel, Blakeney, Gloucestershire, Innkeeper. Feb 9 at 4. Official Receiver, 15, King st, Gloucester
Furtwangler, Andreas, Strand, Watchmaker. Feb 10 at 12.30. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
Graham, William, South st, Park lane, Riding Master. Feb 12 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
Hitchcock, Thomas, Newport Pagnell, Buckinghamshire, Tailor. Feb 9 at 11. County Court, Northampton
Illingworth, Luke, Sheffield, Stonemason. Feb 10 at 11. Official Receiver, Figtree lane, Sheffield
Jacobs, William, Treorky, Glam., Furniture Dealer. Feb 11 at 12. Official Receiver, Merthyr Tydfil
Jenkins, David, Tenby, Tailor. Feb 9 at 1.30. Official Receiver, Carmarthen

Jenkinson, Thomas, Gt Grimsby, Lincolnshire, Tailor. Feb 10 at 2. Official Receiver, 3, Haven st, Gt Grimsby
Jones, Kyffin, Ruthin, Denbighshire, Hotel Keeper. Feb 11 at 11. Official Receiver, Crypt chbrs, Chester
Mason, Alfred Edmund, Derby, Oil Merchant. Feb 10 at 2.30. Official Receiver, St James's chbrs, Derby
Mead, Samuel Robert, Frome, Somerset, Hatter. Feb 10 at 12.30. Official Receiver, Bank chbrs, Bristol
Neath, Joseph, Kibworth Beauchamp, Leicestershire, Licensed Victualler. Feb 11 at 12. 28, Friar lane, Leicester
Nicholl, Ann, Halifax, Finisher. Feb 11 at 11. Official Receiver, Townhall chbrs, Halifax
Petchell, William, Kettering, Shoe Manufacturer. Feb 9 at 3. County Court, Northampton
Raper, John, Victoria Dock rd, Canning town, Boot Manufacturer. Feb 10 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
Reece, Henry, Shirenewton, Mon, Haulier. Feb 11 at 12. Official Receiver, Newport, Mon
Smith, John, Brighton, Beer Retailer. Feb 9 at 12. Official Receiver, 39, Bond st, Brighton
Strick, James, Jermyn st. Feb 15 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
Torrens, William Torrens McCullagh, Brixton rd, Barrister at Law. Feb 11 at 2. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
Turner, Henry, Mickfield, Suffolk, Farmer. Feb 9 at 12.30. Official Receiver, 3, Westgate st, Ipswich
Turver, Thomas, Ross, Herefordshire, Farmer. Feb 9 at 2.30. Official Receiver, 3, Offa st, Hereford
Walton, John, Whitechapel rd, Tailor. Feb 11 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
Waters, George, East Grinstead, Sussex, Licensed Victualler. Feb 10 at 2.30. Official Receiver, Bond st, Brighton
Watmough, Richard, Clee, Lincolnshire, Steam Tug Owner. Feb 10 at 1. Official Receiver, 3, Haven st, Gt. Grimsby
Williams, Levi Edward, Lampeter Velfrey, Pembrokeshire, Weaver, Feb 9 at 2.30. Official Receiver, 11, Quay st, Carmarthen
Williams, Thomas, Llanstephan, Carmarthenshire, Miller. Feb 11 at 11. Official Receiver, 11, Quay st, Carmarthen
Wilson, Charles Watson, Salcombe, Devon, no occupation. Feb 15 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
Wolff, E., Great Prescott st. Feb 10 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
Wolff, Victor, Hatton Garden, Diamond Merchant. Feb 19 at 2. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields

ADJUDICATIONS.

Abell, William Henry, Hereford, China Dealer. Hereford. Pet Jan 14. Ord Jan 30
Archer, Rowland, Manchester, recently Tarpaulin Manufacturer. Manchester. Pet Dec 8. Ord Jan 28
Beardmore, James, junr, Longton, Staffordshire, Ironmonger's Assistant. Stoke upon Trent and Longton. Pet Jan 23. Ord Jan 28
Bentley, Robert, Rastrick, nr Halifax, Joiner. Halifax. Pet Nov 26. Ord Jan 29
Biggs, John, Crondall st, Hoxton, Tinplate Worker. High Court. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30
Biven, William James, Bristol, Commercial Traveller. Bristol. Pet Jan 23. Ord Jan 30
Brookhouse, Edward Frederick, Bath, Hotel Proprietor. Derby. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 26
Burkinshaw, Joseph, John, Lincoln, Farmer. Lincoln. Pet Dec 11. Ord Jan 28
Bush, William, North st, Limehouse fields, Fish Curer. High Court. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30
Chase, Herbert, Thavies inn, Holborn, Tea Merchant. High Court. Pet Dec 17. Ord Jan 28
Chattock, Thomas, Brockenhurst, Hampshire, Gent. Southampton. Pet Jan 15. Ord Jan 29
Clayton, Joseph, Nottingham, Photographer. Nottingham. Pet Jan 12. Ord Jan 30
Dards, Joseph, Kennington park rd, Lighterman. High Court. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 29
Davis, Isaac, Joseph, Alvington crescent, Dalston, Auctioneer. High Court. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 28
Driver, Jane, Windsor, Widow. Windsor. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28
Dolman, Abel Upton, Birmingham, Commission Agent. Birmingham. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 29
Earp, W. T., High st, Wandsworth, Corn Dealer. Wandsworth. Pet Nov 18. Ord Jan 28
Foster, William, Broadgate, Lincoln, Coachbuilder. Lincoln. Pet Jan 2. Ord Jan 28
Gedney, Upper Gloucester pl, Widow. High Court. Pet Dec 5. Ord Jan 29
Gent, William Edward, Darlington, Joiner. Stockton on Tees and Middlesborough. Pet Dec 4. Ord Jan 28
Godden, John, Taunton, Oil Merchant. Taunton. Pet Jan 14. Ord Jan 30
Hardy, James, Vineyard walk, Clerkenwell, Coach Painter. High Court. Pet Jan 22. Ord Jan 28
Heynes, Henry, Bush lane, Shipping Agent. High Court. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 29
Illingworth, Luke, Sheffield, Stone Mason. Sheffield. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28
Jackson, Edward Samuel, Speldhurst, Kent, Farmer. Tunbridge Wells. Pet Jan 8. Ord Jan 29
Lamb, James Morgan, Lower Town, Fishguard, Grocer. Pembroke Dock. Pet Jan 14. Ord Jan 30
Lowe, Joseph, Lower Broughton, Lancashire. Salford. Pet June 30. Ord Jan 27
Lucas, Charles, Wishford, Innkeeper. Salisbury. Pet Jan 19. Ord Jan 25
Mason, Alfred Edmund, Derby, Oil Merchant. Derby. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 28
Meggs, Benjamin Oldroyd, Earlsheaton, nr Dewsbury, Yorks, Salesman. Dewsbury. Pet Jan 20. Ord Jan 28
Moulton, Edward, Cranham, Gloucestershire, Potter. Gloucester. Pet Jan 29. Ord Jan 29
Osang, Frederick William Ludweg, Wardour st, Soho, Boot Manufacturer. High Court. Pet Jan 9. Ord Jan 29
Page, Frank, Carter lane, Linen Collar Manufacturer. High Court. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 29
Reece, Henry, Shirenewton, Mon, Haulier. Newport, Mon. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 29
Rowland, James, Boston, Lincolnshire, Fisherman. Boston. Pet Jan 30. Ord Jan 30
Shead, Walter, Braintree, Essex, Baker. Chelmsford. Pet Jan 25. Ord Jan 29
Shepherd, George William David, Folkestone, Plasterer. Canterbury. Pet Jan 12. Ord Jan 29
Squire, William, Barnsley, Tailor. Barnsley. Pet Jan 19. Ord Jan 30
Taylor, John Beadle, Kegworth, Leicestershire, Commission Agent. Leicester. Pet Dec 30. Ord Jan 28
Thornton, George, Morecambe, Lancashire, Grocer. Preston. Pet Jan 14. Ord Jan 30
Turner, Henry, Mickfield, Suffolk, Farmer. Ipswich. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 28
Watmough, Richard, Clee, Lincolnshire, Steam Tug Owner. Gt. Grimsby. Pet Jan 27. Ord Jan 28
Wiggins, Mary Roberts, Princess st, Barnsley, Dressmaker. Barnsley. Pet Jan 28. Ord Jan 30
Woodall, Alfred, Brayton, nr Selby, Yorks, Joiner. York. Pet Jan 14. Ord Jan 29
Wolff, Victor, Hatton gdn, Diamond Merchant. High Coort. Pet Dec 1. Ord Jan 29

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the* WEEKLY REPORTER, *52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.*

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

CONTENTS.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the return of rejected communications.

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.—*All communications intended for publication in the* SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer.*

*** *The Publisher requests that early application should be made by persons desirous of obtaining back numbers of the* SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, *as only a small number of copies remain on hand*